

Estimation and Inference in Factor Copula Models with Exogenous Covariates*

Alexander Mayer^{1,a} and Dominik Wied²

^{1,2}*Institute of Econometrics and Statistics, University of Cologne*

^aCorresponding author, email: a.mayer@statistik.uni-koeln.de

July 8, 2021

Abstract

A factor copula model is proposed in which factors are either simulable or estimable from exogenous information. Point estimation and inference are based on a simulated methods of moments (SMM) approach with non-overlapping simulation draws. Consistency and limiting normality of the estimator is established and the validity of bootstrap standard errors is shown. Doing so, previous results from the literature are verified under low-level conditions imposed on the individual components of the factor structure. Monte Carlo evidence confirms the accuracy of the asymptotic theory in finite samples and an empirical application illustrates the usefulness of the model to explain the cross-sectional dependence between stock returns.

Keywords: factor analysis, simulation estimator, empirical process, dependence modeling.

JEL classifications: C13, C15, C22.

*Financial support by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG grant ‘Strukturbrüche und Zeitvariation in hochdimensionalen Abhängigkeitsstrukturen’) is gratefully acknowledged. We are grateful for helpful discussions with Hans Manner and Florian Stark as well as for computational support from Sebastian Valet. Suggestions and comments made by participants of the 7th RCEA Time Series Workshop and research seminars in Bonn and Cologne are highly appreciated.

1 Introduction

Factor copula models have been successfully introduced as a means to cope with data of high cross-sectional dimensionality; see, e.g., Krupskii and Joe (2013), Creal and Tsay (2015), and Oh and Patton (2017). The use of a latent factor structure offers an economically intuitive yet flexible way to multivariate modeling that parsimoniously handles commonly encountered characteristics of financial time series like, for example, the tail asymmetry and tail dependence described by Hansen (1994). Recently, some research effort has been devoted to incorporate time variation and exogenous information to factor copula models; see, e.g., Creal and Tsay (2015), Oh and Patton (2018), Opschoor *et al.* (2020), and Krupskii and Joe (2020). Among these studies, the closest to ours are the investigations of Oh and Patton (2018) and Opschoor *et al.* (2020), who, by utilizing the generalized autoregressive score (GAS) framework of Creal *et al.* (2013), consider specifications with latent factors and time-varying loadings that may depend on exogenous information. We contribute to this literature by introducing a class of factor copula models with exogenous, (partly) observable *factors*, an idea reminiscent of Bernanke *et al.* (2005), Boivin *et al.* (2009), and Stock and Watson (2005). Thus, contrary to the above cited factor copula models, we take a step back and treat the, possibly group-specific, loadings as time-invariant constants—a concession in the name of tractability that frees us from the necessity of specifying parametric marginals [e.g., Oh and Patton (2018)] or a closed form likelihood of the copula [e.g., Opschoor *et al.* (2020)] and thereby allows for a large variety of ‘covariate-augmented’ factor copulas, nesting the model Oh and Patton (2017) as a special case.

Since the copula likelihood is rarely available in closed form for the model class considered here, an SMM framework for estimation and inference is proposed which uses the general principles outlined by Oh and Patton (2013). Our main contribution is a novel distinction between simulable factors and factors that are estimable from exogenous information. Following the seminal SMM literature of McFadden (1989), Pakes and Pollard (1989), and Lee (1992), we exploit the benefits from non-overlapping simulation draws. The incorporation of exogenous covariates considerably

complicates the development of an asymptotic theory as many arguments made by Oh and Patton (2013) do not apply. Nevertheless, we show that all technical hurdles can be overcome by combining recent developments from copula empirical process theory [see, e.g., Bücher and Volgushev (2013), Berghaus *et al.* (2017), and Neumeyer *et al.* (2019)] with a seminal result for extremum estimation with nonsmooth objective function due to Newey and McFadden (1994). In consequence, consistency, limiting normality, and validity of bootstrap standard errors are established. In doing so, we derive the stochastic equicontinuity of the objective function from primitive conditions on the distributional characteristics of the factor structure using the functional central limit theorem (FCLT) of Andrews and Pollard (1994) for α -mixing triangular arrays. The theory developed here verifies earlier equicontinuity results from the literature that made use of high-level conditions; see, e.g., Oh and Patton (2013), Manner *et al.* (2019), and Manner *et al.* (forthcoming). Since stochastic equicontinuity is an essential ingredient of the asymptotic theory that links pointwise and uniform properties, more primitive conditions are of utmost interest. An application to dependence modeling of a cross-section of stock returns of eleven financial companies illustrates the theoretical results and highlights how the incorporation of estimable factors can help to achieve improvements in model performance.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the model. The main results for SMM estimation and inference are contained in Section 3. A small Monte Carlo exercise is conducted in Section 4 and an empirical application can be found in Section 5. Section 6 briefly summarizes and concludes the paper.

2 The model

Our aim is to capture the dependence structure among the cross-sectional entities of the $n \times 1$ vector of financial assets $Y_t := (Y_{1,t}, \dots, Y_{n,t})'$ in time-period $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, conditional on the available information $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(\{Y_j^*, Y_{j-1} : j \leq t\})$, where Y_t^* represents a vector of exogenous regressors. Assuming that the marginal conditional distributions $Y_{i,t} | \mathcal{F}_t \sim H_{i,t}$ are continuous, we can follow

Patton (2006) and uniquely decompose the joint conditional distribution $Y_t \mid \mathcal{F}_t \sim \mathbf{H}_t$ into its n margins and a copula function $\mathbf{C}_t : [0, 1]^n \mapsto [0, 1]$ that completely describes the dependence conditionally on \mathcal{F}_t ; i.e., $Y_t \mid \mathcal{F}_t \sim \mathbf{C}\{\mathbf{H}_{1,t}(Y_{1,t}), \dots, \mathbf{H}_{n,t}(Y_{n,t}) \mid \mathcal{F}_t\}$. For each of the $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ assets, we assume a parametric location-scale specification

$$Y_{i,t} = \mu_{1,i}(R_t, \lambda_{0,i}) + \mu_{2,i}(R_t, \lambda_{0,i})\eta_{i,t}, \quad (2.1)$$

where R_t is an \mathcal{F}_t -measurable $K_1 \times 1$ vector of regressors and the innovations $\{\eta_{i,t} : t \geq 1\}$ are *i.i.d.* and independent of \mathcal{F}_t for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. The parametric first and second moments $\mu_{j,i}$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$, are known up to the $r \times 1$ parameter vector $\lambda_{0,i} := (\lambda_{0,i,1}, \dots, \lambda_{0,i,r})' \in \Lambda_{0,i} \subset \mathbb{R}^r$. Equation (2.1) allows for several commonly encountered ARMA-GARCH specifications; see, e.g., Chen and Fan (2006) and Fan and Patton (2014, section 2.1) for a similar setting.

Assuming continuous margins $F_i(\eta_{i,t} \leq x) := \mathbf{P}(\eta_{i,t} \leq x)$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we can rephrase the conditional joint distribution as

$$Y_t \mid \mathcal{F}_t \sim \mathbf{C}\{\mathbf{F}_1(\eta_{1,t}), \dots, \mathbf{F}_n(\eta_{n,t}) \mid R_t\} =: \mathbf{C}_t\{\mathbf{F}_1(\eta_{1,t}), \dots, \mathbf{F}_n(\eta_{n,t})\}. \quad (2.2)$$

While the effect of R_t on the margins has been completely removed by the use of the location-scale model (2.1), the *joint* cross-sectional distribution of $\eta_t := (\eta_{1,t}, \dots, \eta_{n,t})'$ is allowed to depend on some ‘exogenous’ vector Z_t . Concerning the notion of exogeneity associated with Z_t , two cases—labeled type 1 and type 2—are considered: 1) Z_t is said to be of *type 1* if it is a sub-vector of R_t ; 2) Z_t is said to be of *type 2* if it is independent of R_t . It should be noted that a type 2 regressor can affect the margins of $\eta_{i,t}$, whereas any effect on the margins has been filtered out in the former case. Specifications similar to the first scenario can be found, for example, in Oh and Patton (2018) or Opschoor *et al.* (2020), who consider a conditional copula $\mathbf{C}(\theta_{0,t})$ indexed by a time-varying copula parameter $\theta_{0,t} := \theta_0(Z_t)$ that is driven by GAS-dynamics so that $Z_t = (\eta'_1, \dots, \eta'_{t-1})'$. An immediate implication of a type 2 regressor is that \mathbf{C}_t reduces to its *unconditional* counterpart

$$\mathbf{C}(u_1, \dots, u_n) = \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{F}_1(\eta_{1,t}) \leq u_1, \dots, \mathbf{F}_n(\eta_{n,t}) \leq u_n).$$

Since one obtains \mathbf{C} directly by integrating out Z_t if the regressor is of type 1, the above distinction,

though conceptually important, will turn out to be almost immaterial for the purpose of estimation and inference based on the unconditional copula.

We assume that C can be generated from an auxiliary factor model *via*

$$G(x_1, \dots, x_n) = C\{G_1(x_1), \dots, G_n(x_n)\}, \quad x_i \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.3)$$

where $G_i(x_i) := P(X_{i,t} \leq x_i)$ represents the i -th margin of

$$X_{i,t} = a'_{0,i}F_t + b'_{0,i}Z_t + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (2.4)$$

and $G(x) := P(X_{1,t} \leq x_1, \dots, X_{n,t} \leq x_n)$, $x := (x_1, \dots, x_n)' \in \mathbb{R}^n$, is the corresponding joint distribution. It is crucial to stress that the margins G_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ can differ from the univariate distributions of the observed data and are not of interest here. Rather, equation (2.4) serves as a means to generate the copula C that determines the joint distribution. The peculiar feature of equation (2.4), and the main contribution of this paper, is the distinction between *simulable* and *observable* factors: while $F_t := (F_{t,1}, \dots, F_{t,p_\alpha})'$ is a $p_\alpha \times 1$ vector of latent random variables with known parametric distribution, the $p_\beta \times 1$ vector $Z_t := (Z_{t,1}, \dots, Z_{t,p_\beta})'$ is estimable from observed data. More specifically, both F_t and $\varepsilon_{i,t}$ are *i.i.d.* with parametric distributions

$$D_\varepsilon(x; \delta_0) := P(\varepsilon_{i,t} \leq x), \quad D_{F,j}(x; \gamma_{0,j}) := P(F_{t,j} \leq x), \quad j \in \{1, \dots, p_\alpha\},$$

which are partially known up to the $p_\delta \times 1$ vector $\delta_0 := (\delta_{0,1}, \dots, \delta_{0,p_\delta})'$ and the $p_\alpha p_\gamma \times 1$ vector $\gamma_0 := (\gamma'_{0,1}, \dots, \gamma'_{0,p_\alpha})'$, with $\gamma_{0,j} := (\gamma_{0,j,1}, \dots, \gamma_{0,j,p_\gamma})'$, respectively. On the other hand, the distribution of the vector Z_t is unknown but we assume that its components can be represented as *i.i.d.* innovations

$$Z_{t,j} := Z_{t,j}(\nu_0) = W_{t,j} - \sigma_j(M_t, \nu_{0,j}), \quad j \in \{1, \dots, p_\beta\}, \quad (2.5)$$

where the $K_2 \times 1$ vector M_t comprises short-range dependent covariates (possibly including lagged values of $W_t = (W_{t,1}, \dots, W_{t,p_\beta})'$) and the parametric function $\sigma_j(\cdot, \nu_{0,j})$ is known up to the $m \times 1$ vector $\nu_{0,j} := (\nu_{0,j,1}, \dots, \nu_{0,j,m})' \in \mathcal{V}_{0,j} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. We cannot allow for both time-varying conditional means *and* variances to ensure that the limiting distribution of the SMM estimator is unaffected

by the first step estimation of ν_0 . Note, however, that several models with time-varying conditional variance that obey $\tilde{W}_t = \tilde{\sigma}(M_t, \nu_0)\tilde{Z}_t$, $\sup_{x,y} \tilde{\sigma}(x, y) > 0$, can be cast in form of (2.5) by setting $W_t := \log|\tilde{W}_t|$, $\sigma_t(M_t, \nu_0) := \log \tilde{\sigma}_t(M_t, \nu_0)$, and $Z_t := \log|\tilde{Z}_t|$.¹

As in Oh and Patton (2017, section 4.2) and Opschoor *et al.* (2020, section 2.1.1), it is assumed that the factor loadings $a_{0,i} := (a_{0,i,1}, \dots, a_{0,i,p_\alpha})'$ and $b_{0,i} := (b_{0,i,1}, \dots, b_{0,i,p_\beta})'$ can be grouped into a small number of Q group-specific coefficients $\alpha_{0,q} := (\alpha_{0,q,1}, \dots, \alpha_{0,q,p_\alpha})'$ and $\beta_{0,q} := (\beta_{0,q,1}, \dots, \beta_{0,q,p_\beta})'$, $q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$. Put differently, there exists a finite collection of disjoint sets $\{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_Q\}$ partitioning the cross-sectional index set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $a_{0,i} = a_{0,j} = \alpha_{0,q}$ and $b_{0,i} = b_{0,j} = \beta_{0,q}$ for any $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$, $q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$. Importantly, this ‘block-equidependent’ factor structure implies that the number of latent marginals needed to be specified reduces from n to Q distinct distributions $\mathbf{G}_1, \dots, \mathbf{G}_Q$, say, so that $G_i(x) = G_j(x) =: \mathbf{G}_q(x)$ for any $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$, $q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$. Throughout, the group assignment is assumed to be known.

3 SMM-based estimation and inference

The object of interest is the $p \times 1$ vector $\theta_0 := (\alpha'_{0,1}, \beta'_{0,1}, \dots, \alpha'_{0,Q}, \beta'_{0,Q}, \gamma'_0, \delta'_0)' \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$, which, in view of the latent factor structure (2.3), collects all $p := Q(p_\alpha + p_\beta) + p_\alpha p_\gamma + p_\delta$ unknown copula parameters. A different parameter vector $\theta := (\alpha'_1, \beta'_1, \dots, \alpha'_Q, \beta'_Q, \gamma', \delta')' \in \Theta$ gives rise to an alternative factor structure

$$X_{i,t}(d_i) := a'_i F_t(\gamma) + b'_i Z_t + \varepsilon_{i,t}(\delta), \quad (3.6)$$

say, where the notational conventions $X_{i,t}(d_i)$, $F_t(\gamma) := (F_{t,1}(\gamma_1), \dots, F_{t,p_\alpha}(\gamma_{p_\alpha}))'$, and $\varepsilon_{i,t}(\delta)$ are used to make the dependence of the various quantities on the $(p_\alpha + p_\beta + p_\alpha p_\gamma + p_\delta) \times 1$ vector $d_i := (a'_i, b'_i, \gamma', \delta')'$ explicit; e.g., $\varepsilon_{i,t}(\delta) \sim \mathbf{D}_\varepsilon(\delta)$ and $F_{t,j}(\gamma_j) \sim \mathbf{D}_{F,j}(\gamma_j)$, $j \in \{1, \dots, p_\alpha\}$.

The block-equidependent design ensures that $d_i = d_j = \theta_q$ for any $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$, $q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$,

¹The argument is inspired by Genest *et al.* (2007), who propose this transformation in their example 1 to ensure a nuisance-free distribution of the BDS-type test studied there; see also Caporale *et al.* (2005) for a study of the BDS test based on the logarithm of absolute GARCH(1,1)-residuals.

where the $(p_\alpha + p_\beta + p_\alpha p_\gamma + p_\delta) \times 1$ vector $\theta_q := (\alpha'_q, \beta'_q, \delta', \gamma')'$ contains the parameters specific to the q -th group. Thus, with a slight abuse of notation, $\theta = \cup_{q=1}^Q \theta_q$. Equation (3.6), in turn, generates a differently parametrized copula

$$\begin{aligned} C(u_1, \dots, u_n; \theta) &:= \mathbb{P}\{G_1(X_{1,t}(d_1); d_1) \leq u_1, \dots, G_n(X_{n,t}(d_n); d_n) \leq u_n\} \\ G_i(x; d_i) &:= \mathbb{P}\{X_{i,t}(d_i) \leq x_i\}, \quad u_i \in [0, 1], \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where $G_i(x; d_i) = G_j(x; d_j) =: \mathbb{G}_q(x; \theta_q)$, say, for any $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$, $q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$. The simulation-based estimation achieves identification of $\theta \in \Theta$ at $\theta_0 = \cup_{q=1}^Q \theta_{0,q}$, $\theta_{0,q} = (\alpha'_{0,q}, \beta'_{0,q}, \gamma'_0, \delta'_{0,q})'$, by exploiting assumption A.

Assumption A

- (A1) (i) The joint distribution $F(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \mathbb{P}(\eta_{1,t} \leq x_1, \dots, \eta_{n,t} \leq x_n)$ is continuous with continuous marginal distributions $F_i(x_i)$, $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.
- (ii) The joint distribution $G(x_1, \dots, x_n; \theta) = \mathbb{P}(X_{1,t}(d_1) \leq x_1, \dots, X_{n,t}(d_n) \leq x_n)$ is continuous with continuous marginal distributions $G_i(x_i; d_i)$, $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, uniformly in $\theta \in \Theta$.
- (A2) (i) $C(u_1, \dots, u_n) = C(u_1, \dots, u_n; \theta_0)$ for $u_i \in [0, 1]$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and $\theta_0 \in \Theta \in \mathbb{R}^p$; the parameter space Θ is compact.
- (ii) For any bivariate copula $C_{i,j}(u_i, u_j) := \mathbb{P}(V_{i,t} \leq u_i, V_{j,t} \leq u_j)$ and $C_{i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q) := \mathbb{P}(U_{i,t,s}(\theta_q) \leq u_i, U_{j,t,s}(\theta_q) \leq u_j)$, with $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$, $q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$, it holds that $C_q(u_i, u_j) := C_{i,j}(u_i, u_j) = C_{i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_{0,q}) =: C_q(u_i, u_j; \theta_{0,q})$.

Assumption A formalizes the introductory notion of a factor copula; i.e., the unknown copula $C(u_1, \dots, u_n)$ and each of its bivariate sub-copulae $C_{i,j}(u_i, u_j)$ can be generated by a latent factor structure for a suitable choice $\theta_0 \in \Theta$. Note that the number of distinct bivariate copulae reduces from $n(n-1)/2$ to Q block-specific copulae $C_1(\theta_{0,1}), \dots, C_Q(\theta_{0,Q})$.

3.1 Independent simulations

Akin to the ‘independent simulation’ scheme known from classical SMM estimation [see, e.g. McFadden (1989), Pakes and Pollard (1989), and Lee (1992)], we generate for a given candidate value $\theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ a random sample $\{(F_{t,s}(\gamma)', \varepsilon_{i,t,s}(\delta))' : t = 1, \dots, T, s = 1, \dots, S\}$ to obtain

$$X_{i,t,s}(d_i) := a_i' F_{t,s}(\gamma) + b_i' Z_t + \varepsilon_{i,t,s}(\delta), \quad (3.8)$$

where $F_{t,s}(\gamma) := (F_{t,s,1}(\gamma_1), \dots, F_{t,s,p_\alpha}(\gamma_{p_\alpha}))'$. Hence, we sample for each time period t a new batch of S random variables from D_ε and $D_{F,j}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, p_\alpha\}$. Note that the underlying random draws are held fix while θ is allowed to vary over the compact set Θ . This is important to ensure uniform convergence of simulated moments and to facilitate convergence of the numerical optimization routine used to find θ_0 ; see Gouriéroux and Monfort (1997, p. 29) and Pakes and Pollard (1989, p. 1048) for further remarks. More specifically, let D_ε^{-1} and $D_{F,j}^{-1}$ denote the inverse distribution functions of ε_t and $F_{t,j}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, p_\alpha\}$, respectively. We may then write $\varepsilon_{i,t,s}(\delta) := D_\varepsilon^{-1}(\varepsilon_{i,t,s}^*; \delta)$ and $F_{t,s}(\gamma) := D_F^{-1}(F_{t,s}^*; \gamma)$, with $D_F^{-1}(F_{t,s}^*; \gamma) := (D_{F,1}^{-1}(F_{t,s,1}^*; \gamma_1), \dots, D_{F,p_\alpha}^{-1}(F_{t,s,p_\alpha}^*; \gamma_{p_\alpha}))'$, where $F_{t,s}^* := (F_{t,s,1}^*, \dots, F_{t,s,p_\alpha}^*)'$ and $\varepsilon_{i,t,s}^*$ denote independent draws of *i.i.d.* standard uniform random variates which are drawn once. Since Z_t might be unobservable, we will replace the unknown innovation with $\hat{Z}_t(\hat{\nu}_T) := (\hat{Z}_{t,1}(\hat{\nu}_{T,1}), \dots, \hat{Z}_{t,p_\beta}(\hat{\nu}_{T,p_\beta}))'$, where $\hat{Z}_{t,j}(\nu_j) := W_{t,j} - \sigma_j(M_t, \nu_j)$, $j \in \{1, \dots, p_\beta\}$, represents the generalized residual; the $mp_\beta \times 1$ vector $\hat{\nu}_T := (\hat{\nu}'_{T,1}, \dots, \hat{\nu}'_{T,p_\beta})'$ collects estimators $\hat{\nu}_{T,j} := (\hat{\nu}_{T,j,1}, \dots, \hat{\nu}_{T,j,m})'$, $j \in \{1, \dots, p_\beta\}$, of the components of the true $mp_\beta \times 1$ parameter vector $\nu_0 := (\nu'_{0,1}, \dots, \nu'_{0,p_\beta})'$. Therefore, a feasible counterpart of (3.8) is obtained from

$$\hat{X}_{i,t,s}(d_i, \hat{\nu}_T) := a_i' F_{t,s}(\gamma) + b_i' \hat{Z}_t(\hat{\nu}_T) + \varepsilon_{i,t,s}(\delta). \quad (3.9)$$

3.2 The estimator

Throughout, the cross-sectional dimension n might be large but is considered fixed, while asymptotics are carried out as $T \rightarrow \infty$; the number of simulation draws S is either fixed or a function of T such that $S := S(T) \rightarrow \infty$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Similar to Oh and Patton (2013), estimation aims at minimizing the difference between empirical and simulated rank dependence measures that only depend on the unknown copula. To illustrate, suppose $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$ for some $q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$ and introduce the following two $\ell \times 1$ vectors

$$\hat{\psi}_{T,i,j}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) := (\hat{\psi}_{T,i,j,1}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}), \dots, \hat{\psi}_{T,i,j,\ell}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}))'$$

and

$$\hat{\psi}_{T,S,i,j}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T) := (\hat{\psi}_{T,S,i,j,1}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T), \dots, \hat{\psi}_{T,S,i,j,\ell}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T))'$$

which collect bivariate dependence measures like, for example, Spearman's rank correlation, quantile dependence, and Kendall's-tau; see, e.g., Oh and Patton (2013, p. 691). Formally, these statistics shall be expressed with the help of a suitable collection of bivariate functions $\{\varphi_k : [0, 1]^2 \mapsto \mathbb{R}, 1 \leq k \leq \ell\}$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\psi}_{T,i,j,k}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) &:= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \varphi_k(\hat{V}_{i,t}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,i}), \hat{V}_{j,t}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,j})) \\ \hat{\psi}_{T,S,i,j,k}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T) &:= \frac{1}{TS} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^S \varphi_k(\hat{U}_{i,t,s}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T), \hat{U}_{j,t,s}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T)), \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where $\hat{V}_{i,t}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,i})$, $\hat{U}_{i,t,s}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T)$ represent the rank of $\hat{\eta}_{i,t}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,i}) := \{Y_{i,t} - \mu_{1,i}(R_t, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i})\} / \mu_{2,i}(R_t, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i})$ among $\{\hat{\eta}_{i,t}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,i}) : t = 1, \dots, T\}$ and the rank of $\hat{X}_{i,t,s}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T)$ among $\{\hat{X}_{i,t,s}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T) : t = 1, \dots, T; s = 1, \dots, S\}$, respectively.

The ℓ different bivariate dependence measures are then aggregated according to the group-specific factor structure. To provide some intuition, note that $\hat{\psi}_{T,i,j,k}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j})$ and $\hat{\psi}_{T,S,i,j,k}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T)$, $k \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, can be viewed as sample estimates of the population statistics $\mathbb{E}[\varphi_k(V_{i,t}, V_{j,t})]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\varphi_k(U_{i,t,s}(\theta_q), U_{j,t,s}(\theta_q))]$, with $V_{i,t} := F_i(\eta_{i,t})$, $U_{i,t,s}(\theta_q) := G_q(X_{i,t,s}(\theta_q); \theta_q)$ denoting the theoretical ranks. These statistics depend only on the bivariate copulae $C_q(u_i, u_j)$ and $C_q(u_i, u_j; \theta_q)$, which, due to the identifying assumption (A2), exhibit within-group homogeneity; i.e., each of the ℓ statistics depends on the cross-sectional index set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ only *via* the group-identifier

$q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{q,k}(\theta) &:= \mathbb{E}[\varphi_k(U_{i,t,s}(\theta_q), U_{j,t,s}(\theta_q))] = \int_{[0,1]^2} \varphi_k(u_i, u_j) d\mathbf{C}_q(u_i, u_j; \theta_q) \\ \psi_{q,k} &:= \mathbb{E}[\varphi_k(V_{i,t}, V_{j,t})] = \int_{[0,1]^2} \varphi_k(u_i, u_j) d\mathbf{C}_q(u_i, u_j), \quad k \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}, \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q.\end{aligned}\tag{3.11}$$

Therefore, the following aggregation scheme of bivariate dependence measures is justified

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\psi}_{T,S,q}(\theta, \hat{\nu}_T) &:= \frac{1}{\binom{|\mathcal{G}_q|}{2}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < j \leq n \\ i, j \in \mathcal{G}_q}} \hat{\psi}_{T,S,i,j}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T) \\ \hat{\psi}_{T,q}(\{\hat{\lambda}_{T,i} : i \in \mathcal{G}_q\}) &:= \frac{1}{\binom{|\mathcal{G}_q|}{2}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < j \leq n \\ i, j \in \mathcal{G}_q}} \hat{\psi}_{T,i,j}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}), \quad q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.12}$$

We thus obtain the $\bar{\ell} \times 1$, $\bar{\ell} := Q\ell$, vector of empirical dependence measures

$$\hat{\psi}_T(\hat{\lambda}_T) := (\hat{\psi}_{T,1}(\{\hat{\lambda}_{T,i} : i \in \mathcal{G}_1\})', \dots, \hat{\psi}_{T,Q}(\{\hat{\lambda}_{T,i} : i \in \mathcal{G}_Q\})')'$$

for $\hat{\lambda}_T := (\hat{\lambda}'_{T,1}, \dots, \hat{\lambda}'_{T,n})'$, and the $\bar{\ell} \times 1$ vector of simulated dependence measures

$$\hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\theta, \hat{\nu}_T) := (\hat{\psi}_{T,S,1}(\theta_1, \hat{\nu}_T)', \dots, \hat{\psi}_{T,S,Q}(\theta_Q, \hat{\nu}_T)')'$$

respectively. Taking the preceding into account, we can, for some stochastically bounded and positive-definite weight matrix $\hat{W}_{T,S}$, define the SMM estimator as the minimizer

$$\hat{\theta}_{T,S} := \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \hat{A}_{T,S}(\theta, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T),\tag{3.13}$$

where

$$\hat{A}_{T,S}(\theta, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T) := \hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\theta, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T)' \hat{W}_{T,S} \hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\theta, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T),$$

with $\hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\theta, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T) = \hat{\psi}_T(\hat{\lambda}_T) - \hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\theta, \hat{\nu}_T)$.

3.3 Limiting normality

As pointed out by Oh and Patton (2013), the objective function is non-differentiable and, in general, does not possess a population counterpart in known closed form. Thus, some care is required in deriving the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\theta}_{T,S}$. Due to the mutual dependence on the covariate,

$\hat{\psi}_T(\hat{\lambda}_T)$ and $\hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\theta, \hat{\nu}_T)$ are not independent, which considerably complicates the analysis and precludes a direct application of the arguments developed by the aforementioned authors. To shed some light, let us recall from Newey and McFadden (1994) that two crucial high-level conditions for asymptotic normality of $\sqrt{T}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S} - \theta_0)$ are (1) limiting normality of the normalized sample ‘moments’ $\sqrt{T}\hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\theta, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T)$ evaluated at $\theta = \theta_0$ and (2) the stochastic equicontinuity of random map $\theta \mapsto \sqrt{T}\hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\theta, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T)$. Both conditions are shown to be closely tied to the limiting behaviour of the triangular-array empirical process

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T) \\ & := \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T [1\{\hat{\eta}_{i,t}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,i}) \leq \hat{F}_{T,i}^-(u_i; \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}), \hat{\eta}_{j,t}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) \leq \hat{F}_{T,j}^-(u_j; \hat{\lambda}_{T,j})\} \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S 1\{\hat{X}_{i,t,s}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T) \leq \hat{G}_{T,S,i}^-(u_i; \theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T), \hat{X}_{j,t,s}(\theta, \hat{\nu}_T) \leq \hat{G}_{T,S,j}^-(u_j; \theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T)\}], \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

where $H^-(p) := \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : H(x) \geq p, p \in (0, 1]\}$ denotes the left-continuous generalized inverse function of a distribution function H , and

$$\hat{F}_{T,k}(x; \hat{\lambda}_{k,T}) := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T 1\{\hat{\eta}_{k,t}(\hat{\lambda}_{k,T}) \leq x\}, \quad \hat{G}_{T,S,k}(x; \theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T) := \frac{1}{TS} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^S 1\{\hat{X}_{k,t,s}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T) \leq x\},$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $k \in \{i, j\}$, with $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$, $q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$. More specifically, taking Fermanian *et al.* (2004, theorem 6) and Bücher and Segers (2013, Lemma 7.2) into account, we can express the k -th entry of $\hat{\Psi}_{T,S,i,j}(\theta_q, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T) := \hat{\psi}_{T,i,j}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) - \hat{\psi}_{T,S,i,j}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T)$ as a Lebesgue-Stieltjes integral

$$\sqrt{T}\hat{\Psi}_{T,S,i,j,k}(\theta_q, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T) = \int_{[0,1]^2} \hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T) d\varphi_k(u_i, u_j) + o_p(1) \quad (3.15)$$

for $k \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$. Hence, the limiting distribution of $\sqrt{T}\hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\theta_0, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T)$ can be deduced from the weak convergence of the process $\{\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_{0,q}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T) : u_i, u_j \in [0, 1]\}$, which is readily recognized as the difference between two empirical copula processes. Since filtered data is used, an invariance result with respect to the corresponding statistics based on the unknown counterparts is desirable. If empirical and simulated rank statistics are independent, then it suffices to show that the empirical copula processes based on $\hat{V}_{i,t}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,i})$ and $\hat{U}_{i,t,s}(\theta_{0,q}, \hat{\nu}_T)$ share the same weak limit; a

proof strategy employed by Oh and Patton (2013) who argue along the lines of Rémillard (2017). Here, we require the somewhat stronger notion of uniform asymptotic negligibility; i.e., we show, under sufficient regularity of the data, that

$$\sup_{u_i, u_j \in [0,1]} \sup_{\theta_q \in \Theta} |\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T) - \hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \lambda_{0,i}, \lambda_{0,j}, \nu_0)| = o_p(1), \quad (*)$$

for each $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$, $q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$. There exist already similar results in the literature for β -mixing processes [see Neumeier *et al.* (2019) and Chen *et al.* (2020) who rely on Dette *et al.* (2009) and Akritas and Van Keilegom (2001, lemma 1)]; the underlying stochastic equicontinuity result of Doukhan *et al.* (1995) is, however, not directly applicable to the triangular-array case considered here. In order to overcome this difficulty, we resort to the FCLT of Andrews and Pollard (1994, theorem 2.2). The following regularity conditions are assumed to hold:

Assumption B

(B1) $\{Z_t : t \geq 1\}$, $\{F_t : t \geq 1\}$ and $\{\varepsilon_t : t \geq 1\}$ are mutually independent *i.i.d.* sequences with $\varepsilon_{i,t} \perp \varepsilon_{j,t}$, $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $F_{t,i} \perp F_{t,j}$, $i, j \in \{1, \dots, p_\alpha\}$;

(B2) $\{X_t, \eta_t : t \geq 1\}$ is an *i.i.d.* sequence.

Assumption C For each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the i -th first-order partial derivative $\partial_i C(u_1, \dots, u_n; \theta)$ exists and is continuous on the set $\{(u_1, \dots, u_n)' \in [0, 1]^n : 0 < u_i < 1\}$ uniformly in $\theta \in \Theta$. The same holds for each bivariate copula $\{C_q(u_i, u_j; \theta_q) : q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}\}$.

Assumption D

(D1) (i) For each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} f_i(x) < \infty$, $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |xf_i(x)| < \infty$, $f_i\{F_i^{-1}(x)\}(1 + F_i^{-1}(x)) = 0$ as $x \rightarrow 0$ or $x \rightarrow 1$, where f_i denotes the marginal density of F_i .

(ii) For each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $\max_{k,l \in \{i,j\}} \sup_{x_i, x_j \in \mathbb{R}} |\partial_l \partial_k F_{i,j}(x_i, x_j)(1 + x_k)(1 + x_l)| < \infty$, where $F_{i,j}$ is the bivariate distribution function $F_{i,j}(x_i, x_j) := P(\eta_{i,t} \leq x_i, \eta_{j,t} \leq x_j)$.

(D2) For each $q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$, $\sup_{\theta_q \in \Theta} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |g_q(x; \theta_q)| < \infty$ and $\sup_{\theta_q \in \Theta} g_q\{G_q^{-1}(x; \theta_q); \theta_q\} = 0$ as $x \rightarrow 0$ or $x \rightarrow 1$, where g_q denotes the marginal density of G_q .

(D3) $D_\varepsilon(x; \delta)$ and $D_{F,j}(x; \gamma_j)$, $j \in \{1, \dots, p_\alpha\}$, are continuous and strictly increasing distribution functions, which are known up to finite dimensional parameter δ and $\gamma := (\gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_{p_\alpha})'$, respectively.

- (i) $\sup_{\delta \in \Theta} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} d_\varepsilon(x; \delta) < \infty$, where d_ε denotes the marginal density of D_ε .
- (ii) There exists an integrable function $\dot{Q}_F : [0, 1] \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ bounding $\sup_{\gamma_j \in \Theta} |D_{F,j}^{-1}(u, \gamma_j)|$ and $\sup_{\gamma_j \in \Theta} \|\nabla_{\gamma_j} D_{F,j}^{-1}(u, \gamma_j)\|$ from above for any $j \in \{1, \dots, p_\alpha\}$.

Assumption E

- (E1) (i) $\lambda_{0,i} \in \Lambda_{0,i} \subset \mathbb{R}^r$ such that $\sqrt{T}\|\hat{\lambda}_{T,i} - \lambda_{0,i}\| = O_p(1)$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, with $\Lambda_{0,i}$ being compact.
- (ii) $\nu_{0,j} \in \mathcal{V}_{0,j} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $\sqrt{T}\|\hat{\nu}_{T,j} - \nu_{0,j}\| = O_p(1)$, $j \in \{1, \dots, p_\beta\}$, with $\mathcal{V}_{0,j}$ being compact.
- (E2) (i) Define $\Lambda_{T,i} := \{\lambda \in \Lambda_{0,i} : \|\lambda - \lambda_{0,i}\| \leq K_\lambda/\sqrt{T}, K_\lambda < \infty\}$ and let \mathcal{S}_R denote the support of R_t . There exists some $\dot{\mu}_i(R)$ bounding $\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{T,i}, R \in \mathcal{S}_R} \|\nabla_\lambda \mu_{j,i}(R, \lambda)/\mu_{2,i}(R, \lambda_{0,i})\|$ and $\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{T,i}, R \in \mathcal{S}_R} \|\nabla_\lambda^2 \mu_{j,i}(R, \lambda)/\mu_{2,i}(R, \lambda_{0,i})\|$ from above so that $E[\dot{\mu}_i(R)^4] < \infty$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and any $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Moreover, $\inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{T,i}, R \in \mathcal{S}_R} \mu_{2,i}(R, \lambda) \geq 1/\underline{b}$ for some $\underline{b} \in (0, \infty)$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.
- (ii) Define $\mathcal{V}_{T,j} := \{\nu \in \mathcal{V}_{0,j} : \|\nu - \nu_{0,j}\| \leq K_\nu/\sqrt{T}, K_\nu < \infty\}$ and let \mathcal{S}_M denote the support of M_t . For each $j \in \{1, \dots, p_\beta\}$, there exists a square integrable function $\dot{\sigma}_j(M)$ bounding $\sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}_{T,j}, M \in \mathcal{S}_M} \|\nabla_\nu \sigma_j(M, \nu)\|$ and $\sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}_{T,j}, M \in \mathcal{S}_M} \|\nabla_\nu^2 \sigma_j(M, \nu)\|$ from above.
- (E3) (i) $\eta_{i,t} \perp R_t$, where R_t is strictly stationary and α -mixing with mixing number $\alpha_R(j) = O(j^{-c})$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$, where $c > (c_1 - 1)(c_1 + c_2)/c_2$ for $c_1 := \min\{i \in \mathbb{N} : i > 4(1+r)(2+c_2)\}$ and $c_2 > 0$,
- (ii) $Z_{t,j} \perp M_t$, $j \in \{1, \dots, p_\beta\}$, where M_t is strictly stationary and α -mixing with mixing number $\alpha_M(j) = O(j^{-c})$, where $c > (c_1 - 1)(c_1 + c_2)/c_2$ for $c_1 := \min\{i \in \mathbb{N} : i > 2(2 + p_\alpha(1 + p_\gamma) + p_\beta(1 + m) + p_\delta)(2 + c_2)\}$ and $c_2 > 0$.

Assumption F For some $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$, fix $w_j := (u_{1,j}, \dots, u_{n,j})' \in [0, 1]^n$, $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, and define

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_S(k, l) := & \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{C}_t(w_k \wedge w_l) - \mathcal{C}_t(w_k)\mathcal{C}_t(w_l)] + \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{C}_t(w_k \wedge w_l; \theta_0) - \mathcal{C}_t(w_k; \theta_0)\mathcal{C}_t(w_l; \theta_0)]/S \\ & + \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{C}_t(w_k) - \mathcal{C}_t(w_k; \theta_0))(\mathcal{C}_t(w_l) - \mathcal{C}_t(w_l; \theta_0))], \quad (k, l) \in \{1, \dots, m\}, \end{aligned}$$

with $\mathcal{C}_t(w_j; \theta) := \mathbb{P}(U_{1,t}(d_1) \leq u_{1,j}, \dots, U_{n,t}(d_n) \leq u_{n,j} \mid Z_t)$, $\mathcal{C}_t(w_j) := \mathbb{P}(V_{1,t} \leq u_{1,j}, \dots, V_{n,t} \leq u_{n,j} \mid Z_t)$. Then, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$, the matrix $\Gamma_{m,S} := \{\gamma_S(k, l)\}_{1 \leq k, l \leq m}$ is positive definite uniformly in S . The same holds for any bivariate $\Gamma_{q,m,S} := \{\gamma_{q,S}(k, l)\}_{1 \leq k, l \leq m}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{q,S}(k, l) := & \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u_k \wedge u_l, v_k \wedge v_l) - \mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u_k, v_k)\mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u_l, v_l)] \\ & + \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u_k \wedge u_l, v_k \wedge v_l; \theta_{q,0}) - \mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u_k, v_k; \theta_{q,0})\mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u_l, v_l; \theta_{q,0})]/S \\ & + \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u_k, v_k) - \mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u_k, v_k; \theta_{q,0}))(\mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u_l, v_l) - \mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u_l, v_l; \theta_{q,0}))], \quad (k, l) \in \{1, \dots, m\}, \end{aligned}$$

for $u_i, v_i \in [0, 1]$, $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, with $\mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u, v; \theta_q) := \mathbb{P}(U_{i,t}(\theta_q) \leq u, U_{j,t}(\theta_q) \leq v \mid Z_t)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u, v) := \mathbb{P}(V_{i,t} \leq u, V_{j,t} \leq v \mid Z_t)$, $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$, $q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$.

Assumption G $\{\varphi_k : 1 \leq k \leq \ell\}$ are of uniformly bounded Hardy-Krause variation; see, e.g., Berghaus *et al.* (2017).

Assumption B formalizes the characteristics of the factor model and constitutes a naturally extension of Oh and Patton (2017). The smoothness condition C—due to Segers (2012)—is needed to apply the functional delta method; see also Bücher and Volgushev (2013). Assumptions (D1) and (D2) are similar to regularity conditions imposed by Neumeyer *et al.* (2019, p. 141); as discussed in Côté *et al.* (2019) and Omelka *et al.* (2020), this assumption can be relaxed at the expense of additional technicalities. Assumption (D3) summarizes conditions which, in conjunction with the remaining assumptions, ensure the asymptotic equicontinuity of $\theta_q \mapsto \hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(\theta_q)$. When compared to similar conditions used by Manner *et al.* (forthcoming, assumption 5), assumption (D3) is relatively primitive. The assumption is, for example, satisfied if factors and idiosyncratic errors are Gaussian. Assumption E concerns the marginal time-series models: part (E1) is high-level and can be verified for many estimators of ARMA-GARCH type-models [see Francq and Zakoïan (2004)

for a more primitive underpinning]; part (E2) is similar to Chen and Fan (2006, assumption N) and means that the gradient vectors of the location and scale functions are locally dominated; the mixing sizes mentioned in part (E3) are chosen as to match the conditions of the FCLT in Andrews and Pollard (1994, theorem 2.2). Assumption F is a regularity condition needed to establish the convergence of finite dimensional distributions of $\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}$. It is important to note that, in general, neither are $\mathcal{C}_t(\theta)$ and \mathcal{C}_t conditional copulae nor do they need to be equal. However, if Z_t is of type 1, then $\mathcal{C}_t = \mathcal{C}_t$ because, by assumption B, $F_i(\eta_{i,t} | Z_t) = F_i(\eta_{i,t}) = V_{i,t}$. Moreover, if the margins of simulated and observable data are the same, then the covariance matrix mentioned in assumption F reduces to $\Gamma_{q,m,S} = (1 + 1/S)\Gamma_{q,m}$, with $\Gamma_{q,m} := \{\gamma_q(k, l)\}_{1 \leq k, l \leq m}$, $q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$, where

$$\gamma_q(k, l) := \mathbf{E}[\mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u_k \wedge u_l, v_k \wedge v_l) - \mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u_k, v_k)\mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u_l, v_l)], \quad u_k, v_k, u_l, v_l \in [0, 1]. \quad (3.16)$$

Finally, assumption G is satisfied by the abovementioned dependence measures.

Proposition 1 distills the main ingredients needed to derive the asymptotic properties of the SMM estimator.

Proposition 1 Suppose assumptions A, B, C, D, E, F, and G hold true.

- (a) For each $\theta \in \Theta$, $\hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\theta, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T) \xrightarrow{P} \Psi(\theta) := \psi - \psi(\theta)$, where $\psi := (\psi'_1, \dots, \psi'_Q)'$ and $\psi(\theta) := (\psi_1(\theta_1)', \dots, \psi_Q(\theta_Q)')'$ are $\bar{\ell} \times 1$ vectors; typical elements of the $\ell \times 1$ vectors $\psi_q := (\psi_{q,1}, \dots, \psi_{q,\ell})'$ and $\psi_q(\theta) := (\psi_{q,1}(\theta), \dots, \psi_{q,\ell}(\theta))'$ are given in equation (3.11).
- (b) $\sqrt{T}\hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\theta_0, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0_{\bar{\ell}}, \Sigma_{0,S})$, with $\Sigma_{0,S} := \{\Sigma_{0,S}(g, q)\}_{1 \leq g, q \leq Q}$ being a block-symmetric variance-covariance matrix whose (g, q) -th block is given by the $\ell \times \ell$ positive-definite matrix $\Sigma_{0,S}(g, q) := \{\sigma_{0,S}(g, q | k, l)\}_{1 \leq k, l \leq \ell}$ with typical element

$$\sigma_{0,S}(g, q | k, l) := \int_{[0,1]^2} \int_{[0,1]^2} \mathbf{E}[\mathcal{C}_{g,S}(u_1, v_1)\mathcal{C}_{q,S}(u_2, v_2)] d\varphi_k(u_1, v_1) d\varphi_l(u_2, v_2),$$

with

$$\mathcal{C}_{q,S}(u, v) := \mathbb{B}_{q,S}(u, v) - \partial_u \mathcal{C}_q(u, v)\mathbb{B}_{q,S}(u, 1) - \partial_v \mathcal{C}_q(u, v)\mathbb{B}_{q,S}(1, v),$$

where $\mathbb{B}_{q,S}$ is a mean-zero Gaussian process such that for any $m \in \mathbb{N}_1$

$$(\mathbb{B}_{q,S}(u_1, v_1), \dots, \mathbb{B}_{q,S}(u_m, v_m))' \stackrel{d}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0_m, \Gamma_{q,m,S}), \quad q \in \{1, \dots, Q\},$$

with $\Gamma_{q,m,S}$ defined in assumption F.

(c) For any $\epsilon, \eta > 0$, there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{\theta, \tilde{\theta} \in \Theta: \|\theta - \tilde{\theta}\| \leq \delta} \sqrt{T} \|\hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\theta, \hat{\nu}_T) - \psi(\theta) - \hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\nu}_T) + \psi(\tilde{\theta})\| > \eta \right] < \epsilon.$$

The limiting distribution of $\sqrt{T}\hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\theta_0, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T)$ is unaffected by the first-step estimation error, a finding which, in view of (*), was to be expected. A closer inspection of the limiting variance-covariance matrix reveals that the limiting distribution depends on the covariate Z_t and the partial derivatives of the copula through the covariance kernel $\Gamma_{q,m,S}$ of the Gaussian processes $\mathbb{B}_{q,S}$, $q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$, whose dependence on S vanishes if $S = S(T) \rightarrow \infty$. The stochastic equicontinuity result, in turn, provides the link between the pointwise properties of $\theta \mapsto \hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\theta, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T)$ and the asymptotic behavior of $\hat{\theta}_{T,S}$. To make the argument precise, an additional set of regularity conditions is imposed.

Assumption H

- (H1) $\hat{W}_{T,S} = W_{0,S} + o_p(1)$, $W_{0,S}$ is a deterministic $\bar{\ell} \times \bar{\ell}$ positive definite matrix uniformly in S ;
- (H2) $\Psi(\theta) \neq 0_{\bar{\ell}}$ for $\theta \neq \theta_0$;
- (H3) θ_0 is an interior point of the compact set $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$, with $p \leq \bar{\ell} < \infty$
- (H4) $\psi(\theta)$ is differentiable at θ_0 with $\bar{\ell} \times p$ dimensional Jacobian matrix $\nabla_{\theta} \psi(\theta)$ such that $\dot{\psi}'_0 W_{0,S} \dot{\psi}_0$ is nonsingular for $\dot{\psi}_0 := \nabla_{\theta} \psi(\theta_0)$
- (H5) $\hat{A}_{T,S}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T) \leq \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \hat{A}_{T,S}(\theta, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T) + o_p(1/T)$.

Assumption H is common for extremum estimators with non-smooth objective function; see, e.g., Newey and McFadden (1994, section 7). Analogously to Oh and Patton (2013, proposition 2), we

make use of Newey and McFadden (1994, theorem 7.2) to derive the asymptotic normality of the SMM estimator.

Proposition 2 Suppose assumptions A, B, C, D, E, F, G, and H hold. Then,

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S} - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0_{\bar{\ell}}, \Omega_{0,S}), \quad \Omega_{0,S} := (\dot{\psi}'_0 W_{0,S} \dot{\psi}_0)^{-1} \dot{\psi}'_0 W_{0,S} \Sigma_{0,S} W_{0,S} \dot{\psi}_0 (\dot{\psi}'_0 W_{0,S} \dot{\psi}_0)^{-1},$$

where $\Sigma_{0,S}$ is the variance-covariance matrix given in proposition 1.

3.4 Standard errors and inference

We follow Oh and Patton (2013) by resorting to numerical derivatives and the bootstrap to estimate $\dot{\psi}_0$ and the limiting variance-covariance matrix $\Sigma_{0,S}$, respectively. The former estimator is almost completely analogous to the one used by Oh and Patton (2013, p. 692); i.e., for a step size $\pi_T \rightarrow 0^+$ define $\hat{\psi}_{T,S}$, whose k -th column is given by

$$\hat{\psi}_{T,S,k} := \frac{\hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S} + e_k \pi_T, \hat{\nu}_T) - \hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S} - e_k \pi_T, \hat{\nu}_T)}{2\pi_T}, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, p\},$$

where e_k denotes the p -dimensional vector of zeros with one at k -th position.

Contrary to the aforementioned authors, however, the estimator of $\Sigma_{0,S}$ needs to account for the dependence structure induced by the exogenous regressor. Therefore, we propose standard errors based on bootstrap replications of both empirical *and* simulated statistics. More specifically, draw for each $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$, $q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$, with replacement B bootstrap samples $\{\mathcal{Z}_{S,t,i,j}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T)\}_{t=1}^T$, $b \in \{1, \dots, B\}$, from $\{\mathcal{Z}_{S,t,i,j}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T)\}_{t=1}^T$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_{S,t,i,j}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T) &:= (\hat{\eta}_{i,t}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,i}), \hat{\eta}_{j,t}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,j}), \hat{X}_{i,t,1}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\nu}_T), \hat{X}_{j,t,1}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\nu}_T), \dots \\ &\quad \dots, \hat{X}_{i,t,S}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\nu}_T), \hat{X}_{j,t,S}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\nu}_T))', \end{aligned}$$

with $\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}$ representing the $(p_\alpha + p_\beta + p_\alpha p_\gamma + p_\delta) \times 1$ sub-vector of $\hat{\theta}_{T,S}$ that contains the SMM estimates pertaining to group \mathcal{G}_q . Next, denote the corresponding ranks by $\hat{V}_{k,t}^{(b)}(\hat{\lambda}_{k,T})$, $\hat{U}_{k,t,s}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S}, \hat{\nu}_T)$,

$k \in \{i, j\}$. In view of (3.10), introduce the bootstrap rank-based dependence measures

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\psi}_{T,S,i,j,k}^{(b)}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) &:= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \varphi_k(\hat{V}_{i,t}^{(b)}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,i}), \hat{V}_{j,t}^{(b)}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,j})), \\ \hat{\psi}_{T,S,i,j,k}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\nu}_T) &:= \frac{1}{ST} \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{t=1}^T \varphi_k(\hat{U}_{i,t,s}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\nu}_T), \hat{U}_{j,t,s}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\nu}_T)).\end{aligned}\tag{3.17}$$

Akin to the discussion surrounding (3.12), let $\hat{\Psi}_{T,S}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T)$ denote the $\bar{\ell} \times 1$ vector of group-averages of $\hat{\Psi}_{T,S,i,j}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T) := \hat{\psi}_{T,i,j}^{(b)}(\hat{\nu}_T) - \hat{\psi}_{T,S,i,j}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j})$. Following the arguments made by Fermanian *et al.* (2004, theorem 5), we can then show that the conditional distribution of $\sqrt{T}(\hat{\Psi}_{T,S}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T) - \hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T))$ consistently estimates the limiting distribution of $\sqrt{T}\hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\theta_0, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T)$. Importantly, since the first-step estimation of the location-scale parameters does not contaminate the limiting distribution of $\sqrt{T}\hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\theta_0, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T)$, there is no need to adjust for this source of uncertainty as is, for example, done in Gonçalves *et al.* (2019). Hence, the limiting variance-covariance $\Sigma_{0,S}$ is consistently estimable by the bootstrap second moment² $\text{cov}^*[\sqrt{T}\hat{\Psi}_{T,S}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T)]$, provided $\sqrt{T}(\hat{\Psi}_{T,S}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T) - \hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T))$ is uniformly square integrable; see, e.g., Brown and Wegkamp (2002, theorem 7) or Cheng (2015, lemma 1). Since an estimator of $\text{cov}^*[\sqrt{T}\hat{\Psi}_{T,S}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T)]$ is given by

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{T,S,B} := \frac{T}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B (\hat{\Psi}_{T,S}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T) - \hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T)) (\hat{\Psi}_{T,S}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T) - \hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T))',$$

we can introduce the following consistent estimator of $\Omega_{0,S}$

$$\hat{\Omega}_{T,S,B} := (\hat{\psi}'_{T,S} \hat{W}_{T,S} \hat{\psi}_{T,S})^{-1} \hat{\psi}'_{T,S} \hat{W}_{T,S} \hat{\Sigma}_{T,S,B} \hat{W}_{T,S} \hat{\psi}_{T,S} (\hat{\psi}'_{T,S} \hat{W}_{T,S} \hat{\psi}_{T,S})^{-1}.\tag{3.18}$$

Corollary 1 Suppose that $\mathbb{E}^*[\|\sqrt{T}(\hat{\Psi}_{T,S}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T) - \hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T))\|^{2+\delta}] < \infty$ *a.s.* for some $\delta > 0$ and $\sqrt{T}\pi_T \rightarrow \infty$. Then, $\hat{\Omega}_{T,S,B} \xrightarrow{p} \Omega_{0,S}$, as $B, T \rightarrow \infty$.

Corollary 1 allows to conduct inference about θ_0 and to obtain the two-step SMM estimator with optimal weight matrix $\hat{W}_{T,S} = \hat{\Sigma}_{T,S,B}^{-1}$. Provided $\bar{\ell} > p$, the preceding result can also be used to

²Throughout, ‘*’ indicates that the given probability/moment has been computed under the bootstrap distribution conditional on the original sample.

ascertain overidentifying restrictions based on the Sargan-Hansen type J -statistic

$$J_{T,S} := T\hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T)' \hat{W}_{T,S} \hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T) \xrightarrow{d} u' A'_{0,S} A'_{0,S} u, \quad u \sim \mathcal{N}(0_{\bar{\ell}}, I_{\bar{\ell} \times \bar{\ell}}), \quad (3.19)$$

where $A_{0,S} := W_{0,S}^{1/2} \Sigma_{0,S}^{1/2} R_{0,S}$, with $R_{0,S} := I_{\bar{\ell} \times \bar{\ell}} - \Sigma_{0,S}^{-1/2} \dot{\psi}_0 (\dot{\psi}'_0 W_{0,S} \dot{\psi}_0)^{-1} \dot{\psi}'_0 W_{0,S} \Sigma_{0,S}^{1/2}$. Critical values for $J_{T,S}$ need to be simulated (using estimators of $\Sigma_{0,S}$ and $\dot{\psi}_0$) unless the optimal weight matrix is used, in which case the common result $J_{T,S} \xrightarrow{d} \chi^2(\bar{\ell} - p)$ obtains; see also Oh and Patton (2013, proposition 4).

4 Monte Carlo experiment

The Monte Carlo experiment uses a data generating process similar to that in Oh and Patton (2013, p. 695); that is, we consider an AR(1)-GARCH(1,1) process to describe the evolution of each of the n assets:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{i,t} &= 0.01 + 0.05Y_{i,t-1} + \sigma_{i,t}\eta_{i,t} \\ \sigma_{i,t}^2 &= 0.05 + 0.85\sigma_{i,t-1}^2 + 0.1\sigma_{i,t-1}^2\eta_{i,t-1}^2, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, t = 1, \dots, T, \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

where $\eta_t := (\eta_{1,t}, \dots, \eta_{n,t}) \sim \mathbf{C}(\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_n)$, with Φ_i denoting the marginal (Gaussian) distribution function of $\eta_{i,t}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. The copula \mathbf{C} is generated by the following factor model

$$X_{i,t} = a_{0,i}F_t + b_{0,i}Z_t + \varepsilon_{i,t}. \quad (4.21)$$

First, we consider a scenario similar to that in Oh and Patton (2013) where $F_t \sim t(\zeta_{0,1}, \xi_0)$, $\varepsilon_{i,t} \sim t(\zeta_{0,2}, 0)$, with $\zeta_0 := \zeta_{0,1} = \zeta_{0,2} = 1/4$, $\xi_0 = -1/2$, and $Z_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$; F_t , Z_t , and $\varepsilon_{i,t}$ are *i.i.d.* and mutually independent; $t(\zeta, \xi)$ denotes Hansen's standardized skewed t -distribution with tail thickness parameter $2 < 1/\zeta < \infty$ and skewness parameter $-1 < \xi < 1$. Here, we distinguish between two simulation schemes: **design 1** refers to an equidependent factor structure ($Q = 1$), with $\alpha_0 = 1$ and $\beta_0 = 1/2$; **design 2** imposes block-equidependence ($|\mathcal{G}_q| = n/3$, $q \in \{1, 2, 3\}$), with $\alpha_{0,1} = 2$, $\alpha_{0,2} = 1.5$, $\alpha_{0,3} = 1$ and $\beta_{0,q} = 1/2$ for all $q \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. While F_t is latent but simulable, Z_t is either a) simulable or b) estimable from a first-order autoregression $W_t = \nu_0 W_{t-1} + Z_t$, with $\nu_0 = 0.65$.

Hence, design 1 implies 4 unknown copula parameters $\theta_0 = (\alpha_0, \beta_0, \zeta_0, \xi_0)'$ while design 2 implies 6 unknown copula parameters $\theta_0 = (\alpha_{0,1}, \alpha_{0,2}, \alpha_{0,3}, \beta_0, \zeta_0, \xi_0)'$. Estimation of θ_0 is in both cases based on Spearman's rank correlation

$$\hat{\varphi}_{T,i,j,1} := \frac{12}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{V}_{i,t}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,i}) \hat{V}_{j,t}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) - 3, \quad \hat{\varphi}_{T,S,i,j,1} := \frac{12}{ST} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^S \hat{U}_{i,t,s}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T) \hat{U}_{j,t,s}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T) - 3$$

and quantile dependence

$$\hat{\varphi}_{T,i,j,2}^{(\tau)} := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{T\tau} \sum_{t=1}^T 1\{\hat{V}_{i,t}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,i}) \leq \tau, \hat{V}_{j,t}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) \leq \tau\} & \text{if } \tau \in (0, 1/2], \\ \frac{1}{T(1-\tau)} \sum_{t=1}^T 1\{\hat{V}_{i,t}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,i}) > \tau, \hat{V}_{j,t}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) > \tau\} & \text{if } \tau \in (1/2, 1) \end{cases} \quad (4.22)$$

$$\hat{\varphi}_{T,S,i,j,2}^{(\tau)} := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{TS\tau} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^S 1\{\hat{U}_{i,t,s}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T) \leq \tau, \hat{U}_{j,t,s}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T) \leq \tau\} & \text{if } \tau \in (0, 1/2], \\ \frac{1}{TS(1-\tau)} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^S 1\{\hat{U}_{i,t,s}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T) > \tau, \hat{U}_{j,t,s}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T) > \tau\} & \text{if } \tau \in (1/2, 1). \end{cases}$$

Throughout, we set $n \in \{15, 30\}$, $T \in \{500, 1,000, 1,500, 2,000\}$, $S = 25$, $W_{T,S} = I_{\bar{\ell}}$, and make use of $\bar{\ell} = p + 3$ dependence measures³: under equidependence (i.e., design 1 with $Q = 1$), we consider quantile dependence for $\tau \in \{0.15, 0.25, 0.35, 0.65, 0.75, 0.85\}$ alongside Spearman's rank correlation, which yields $\bar{\ell} = \ell = 7$ rank-based dependence measures for estimation; under block-equidependence (i.e., design 2 with $Q = 3$), we make use of quantile dependence for $\tau \in \{0.15, 0.85\}$ and Spearman's rank correlation, which, in turn, implies, with $\ell = 3$ and $Q = 3$, a total of $\bar{\ell} = 9$ rank-based dependence measures. Numerical optimization employs a derivative-free simplex search based on MATLAB's (2019a) `fminsearchbnd` routine; see D'Errico (2021). The starting values are obtained from a first-step surrogate minimization using MATLAB's (2019a) `surrogateopt` optimization for time-consuming objective functions and the individual time-series models are estimated using maximum-likelihood.

Tables 4.1 and 4.2 contain Monte Carlo estimates of mean, median, and variance of the SMM estimator using 500 Monte Carlo iterations. Moreover, we report rejection frequencies of two-sided

³If Z_t is simulable, then we draw $S = 25 \times T$ random draws from the distributions of Z_t , F_t , and $\varepsilon_{i,t}$, which corresponds to the same number of draws used by Oh and Patton (2013).

Table 4.1: Simulation results (design 1)

n	T		observable				simulable				
			ζ_0	ξ_0	α_0	β_0	ζ_0	ξ_0	α_0	β_0	
			0.25	-0.5	1.0	0.5	0.25	-0.5	1.0	0.5	
15	500	mean	0.278	-0.527	0.994	0.458	0.281	-0.535	0.991	0.464	
		median	0.284	-0.508	1.001	0.485	0.287	-0.497	0.994	0.488	
		var	0.004	0.036	0.022	0.023	0.003	0.036	0.020	0.021	
		rmse	0.060	0.191	0.147	0.153	0.058	0.189	0.140	0.144	
		t	2.20	6.80	4.60	2.80	2.60	7.00	3.60	2.00	
		J		2.20				4.60			
1,000		mean	0.261	-0.538	1.001	0.473	0.260	-0.529	1.003	0.472	
		median	0.266	-0.509	1.008	0.489	0.266	-0.504	1.009	0.487	
		var	0.002	0.025	0.011	0.017	0.002	0.022	0.011	0.016	
		rmse	0.052	0.158	0.105	0.129	0.049	0.149	0.104	0.127	
		t	3.00	8.20	2.20	1.00	3.40	7.20	1.80	1.00	
		J		3.40				3.30			
1,500		mean	0.262	-0.529	1.003	0.478	0.259	-0.526	1.006	0.474	
		median	0.263	-0.503	1.006	0.490	0.262	-0.499	1.008	0.490	
		var	0.002	0.020	0.007	0.012	0.002	0.019	0.008	0.012	
		rmse	0.044	0.141	0.086	0.109	0.047	0.139	0.088	0.112	
		t_0	3.20	6.80	1.20	1.80	5.60	8.00	1.40	1.60	
		J		5.10				4.40			
2,000		mean	0.257	-0.525	1.003	0.482	0.256	-0.522	1.005	0.479	
		median	0.259	-0.508	0.998	0.497	0.260	-0.493	1.010	0.487	
		var	0.001	0.017	0.006	0.011	0.001	0.017	0.006	0.010	
		rmse	0.041	0.131	0.080	0.106	0.042	0.132	0.079	0.102	
		t	4.80	7.40	1.60	2.40	3.60	7.20	2.20	2.00	
		J		4.20				4.10			
30	500	mean	0.269	-0.541	0.985	0.477	0.272	-0.537	0.986	0.474	
		median	0.272	-0.506	0.985	0.503	0.272	-0.502	0.989	0.499	
		var	0.003	0.033	0.017	0.023	0.003	0.031	0.017	0.021	
		rmse	0.054	0.181	0.131	0.150	0.053	0.177	0.129	0.146	
		t	4.20	8.00	3.40	1.80	4.80	7.80	2.40	2.00	
		J		2.00				3.20			
1,000		mean	0.258	-0.550	0.995	0.488	0.257	-0.550	0.995	0.487	
		median	0.259	-0.526	1.007	0.505	0.258	-0.531	1.001	0.505	
		var	0.001	0.026	0.009	0.014	0.002	0.026	0.009	0.015	
		rmse	0.039	0.161	0.093	0.117	0.041	0.161	0.096	0.123	
		t	4.40	7.40	2.20	3.00	4.00	7.80	2.80	3.20	
		J		3.20				3.40			
1,500		mean	0.256	-0.549	0.997	0.489	0.254	-0.547	0.999	0.489	
		median	0.256	-0.513	0.995	0.501	0.255	-0.514	1.000	0.500	
		var	0.001	0.025	0.007	0.012	0.001	0.024	0.007	0.012	
		rmse	0.036	0.158	0.082	0.110	0.035	0.154	0.082	0.109	
		t	4.80	7.00	2.40	3.80	4.20	9.00	3.20	3.80	
		J		3.90				4.00			
2,000		mean	0.252	-0.538	1.000	0.491	0.252	-0.540	1.000	0.490	
		median	0.254	-0.501	1.002	0.496	0.255	-0.500	1.005	0.496	
		var	0.001	0.022	0.005	0.010	0.001	0.022	0.005	0.010	
		rmse	0.031	0.147	0.074	0.099	0.033	0.150	0.074	0.101	
		t	4.60	8.40	4.20	4.40	5.80	8.00	3.80	4.80	
		J		3.90				4.50			

Table 4.2: Simulation results (design 2)

n	T		observable						simulable					
			ζ_0	ξ_0	$\alpha_{0,1}$	$\alpha_{0,2}$	$\alpha_{0,3}$	β_0	ζ_0	ξ_0	$\alpha_{0,1}$	$\alpha_{0,2}$	$\alpha_{0,3}$	β_0
			0.25	-0.5	2.0	1.5	1.0	0.5	0.25	-0.5	2.0	1.5	1.0	0.5
15	500	mean	0.248	-0.543	2.011	1.493	0.969	0.476	0.250	-0.544	2.004	1.489	0.967	0.482
		median	0.244	-0.523	1.985	1.487	0.987	0.493	0.246	-0.517	1.988	1.487	0.980	0.499
		var	0.009	0.038	0.062	0.032	0.033	0.035	0.009	0.038	0.049	0.033	0.030	0.035
		rmse	0.097	0.199	0.249	0.178	0.183	0.187	0.094	0.199	0.222	0.182	0.176	0.187
		t	5.20	4.80	4.60	3.60	5.00	8.20	5.00	5.20	5.20	5.80	6.80	9.60
		J			2.40					2.40				
1,000		mean	0.251	-0.539	2.015	1.495	0.975	0.484	0.251	-0.537	2.017	1.491	0.973	0.484
		median	0.247	-0.527	2.002	1.502	0.988	0.497	0.249	-0.522	1.999	1.495	0.988	0.509
		var	0.006	0.032	0.027	0.021	0.021	0.025	0.006	0.045	0.050	0.029	0.024	0.027
		rmse	0.079	0.184	0.166	0.144	0.147	0.160	0.079	0.216	0.224	0.172	0.159	0.166
		t	3.20	2.00	3.60	2.00	5.00	6.60	4.40	5.00	5.60	5.00	8.20	8.60
		J			4.80					4.20				
1,500		mean	0.253	-0.522	2.017	1.503	0.987	0.469	0.253	-0.523	2.016	1.501	0.989	0.473
		median	0.249	-0.510	2.014	1.510	0.998	0.490	0.250	-0.510	2.010	1.510	0.997	0.482
		var	0.005	0.018	0.015	0.011	0.021	0.022	0.005	0.030	0.022	0.017	0.016	0.019
		rmse	0.067	0.136	0.123	0.107	0.147	0.152	0.071	0.174	0.147	0.132	0.125	0.140
		t	2.80	3.20	3.20	3.00	5.00	5.60	6.50	4.00	3.50	4.50	6.00	7.00
		J			4.80					4.60				
2,000		mean	0.253	-0.523	2.017	1.508	0.993	0.470	0.252	-0.519	2.012	1.501	0.991	0.478
		median	0.251	-0.502	2.007	1.508	1.002	0.485	0.247	-0.505	2.008	1.503	0.998	0.486
		var	0.004	0.014	0.012	0.007	0.017	0.020	0.004	0.022	0.014	0.012	0.014	0.018
		rmse	0.063	0.122	0.110	0.083	0.130	0.144	0.061	0.150	0.120	0.111	0.120	0.137
		t	2.40	3.60	3.20	4.40	5.60	7.00	4.40	5.80	3.40	5.20	8.80	7.60
		J			4.50					5.90				
30	500	mean	0.249	-0.516	1.995	1.478	0.964	0.484	0.246	-0.523	1.998	1.481	0.970	0.484
		median	0.249	-0.503	1.975	1.483	0.980	0.494	0.241	-0.510	1.974	1.487	0.985	0.496
		var	0.009	0.042	0.050	0.042	0.034	0.027	0.009	0.038	0.052	0.036	0.030	0.029
		rmse	0.095	0.206	0.224	0.206	0.187	0.165	0.096	0.196	0.229	0.192	0.174	0.171
		t	5.60	1.40	5.80	5.80	3.60	5.20	6.40	2.60	8.60	7.40	6.60	9.20
		J			4.10					6.10				
1,000		mean	0.248	-0.537	2.010	1.490	0.984	0.493	0.249	-0.527	2.010	1.493	0.984	0.487
		median	0.247	-0.514	1.994	1.490	0.993	0.498	0.245	-0.515	1.992	1.491	0.993	0.494
		var	0.005	0.015	0.018	0.016	0.014	0.015	0.005	0.023	0.024	0.016	0.016	0.016
		rmse	0.071	0.129	0.133	0.128	0.119	0.123	0.071	0.154	0.156	0.126	0.126	0.128
		t	4.00	1.60	4.80	2.60	5.20	5.00	4.00	2.40	6.40	4.40	8.20	6.60
		J			5.90					6.00				
1,500		mean	0.251	-0.517	2.012	1.500	0.995	0.480	0.254	-0.509	2.011	1.497	0.991	0.477
		median	0.247	-0.503	2.006	1.502	0.999	0.491	0.251	-0.507	2.008	1.505	1.006	0.488
		var	0.004	0.015	0.014	0.010	0.009	0.012	0.004	0.024	0.017	0.016	0.016	0.012
		rmse	0.063	0.124	0.118	0.098	0.095	0.111	0.066	0.154	0.132	0.128	0.125	0.110
		t	3.40	2.20	4.40	3.00	3.20	3.60	5.80	3.60	4.00	4.40	6.80	4.80
		J			4.60					5.30				
2,000		mean	0.248	-0.518	2.007	1.498	0.996	0.485	0.248	-0.515	2.008	1.502	0.999	0.482
		median	0.247	-0.503	2.002	1.501	1.001	0.491	0.246	-0.502	2.000	1.498	1.002	0.491
		var	0.003	0.010	0.009	0.009	0.008	0.012	0.003	0.009	0.008	0.004	0.006	0.011
		rmse	0.056	0.102	0.093	0.094	0.089	0.109	0.051	0.096	0.091	0.066	0.080	0.106
		t	4.60	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.80	4.80	3.60	6.00	4.20	4.80	6.80	7.00
		J			5.40					5.50				

t -tests under the null $\theta = \theta_0$ and rejection frequencies of the test of overidentifying restrictions 3.19. Both hypothesis tests are investigated at a nominal significance level of five percent and the test statistics are equipped with the bootstrap standard error (3.18). We use $B = 500$ bootstrap replications and set the tuning parameter for the numerical derivative to $\pi_T = 0.05$; moreover, we use 1,000 random draws to obtain critical values for the test of overidentifying restrictions (3.19). The simulation evidence reveals that, in accordance with the theory, the estimation accuracy increases with T while the rejection frequencies are close to the nominal significance level. Moreover, the model with estimable factor Z_t performs equally well as its counterpart where Z_t is simulable. An additional simulation experiment that considers the logarithm of absolute GARCH(1,1) residuals as estimable factor yields a similar conclusion and can be found in Appendix C.

5 Empirical application

We apply the above to study the cross-sectional dependence between $n = 11$ financial firms that match the second largest group of the S&P 100 found by Oh and Patton (2021, table 4). Specifically, we consider daily close prices, adjusted for stock splits using information from CRSP, of the following S&P 100 constituents: Bank of America (BAC), Bank of New York (BK), Citigroup (C), Capital One (COF), Goldman Sachs (GS), JP Morgan (JPM), Metlife (MET), Morgan Stanley (MS), Regions Fin (RF), US Bancorp (USB), Wells Fargo (WFC). Our sample period contains a total of 1,461 trading days ranging from January 2014 to January 2020.

Since gold is often thought to be a hedge and/or a safe haven for stock markets, its price may convey information about the interdependencies between stock returns; see, e.g., Baur and McDermott (2010). Hence, we examine the extent to which information on gold prices can help us to describe the dependence structure among the eleven companies. The conditional mean of the logarithmic return of the i -th stock price $Y_{i,t}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, 11\}$, is modeled as an AR(1) process augmented with the first lag of the logarithmic change of the three *p.m.* gold fixing price in London

bullion market W_t

$$Y_{i,t} = \lambda_{1,i} + \lambda_{2,i}Y_{i,t-1} + \lambda_{3,i}W_{t-1} + \epsilon_{i,t}, \quad \epsilon_{i,t} := \mu_{i,t}\eta_{i,t}, \quad (5.23)$$

while, similar to Oh and Patton (2013, 2017, 2021), the conditional variance $\mu_{i,t}^2$ is assumed to follow a GJR-GARCH(1,1) model

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{i,t}^2 = & \lambda_{4,i} + \lambda_{5,i}\mu_{i,t-1}^2 + \lambda_{6,i}\epsilon_{i,t-1}^2 \\ & + \lambda_{7,i}W_{t-1}^2 + \lambda_{8,i}W_{t-1}^2\mathbb{1}\{W_{t-1} < 0\} + \lambda_{9,i}\epsilon_{i,t-1}^2\mathbb{1}\{\epsilon_{i,t-1} < 0\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

As we clearly fail to reject the null hypothesis⁴ of a zero conditional mean based on an AR(1) specification with unrestricted constant, a GJR-GARCH(1,1) model is considered for the gold price

$$W_t = \sigma_t Z_t, \quad \sigma_t^2 = \nu_1 + \nu_2 \sigma_{t-1}^2 + \nu_3 W_{t-1}^2 \mathbb{1}\{W_{t-1} < 0\}. \quad (5.25)$$

Thus, the use of $\log|\hat{Z}_{t-1}|$ as an estimable factor is justified because, as mentioned earlier, the logarithmic transformation fits into the location specification (2.5). Table 5.1 summarizes descriptive statistics (Panel A) alongside the results from quasi maximum-likelihood estimation with skewed Student's t -distributed innovations (Panel B). The stock returns are left-skewed and leptokurtic with conditional mean and variance dynamics that are similar to findings from the literature; see, e.g., Bollerslev *et al.* (1994). Note that the distribution of W_t (gold), while also leptokurtic, is right-skewed.

Turning to the specification of the conditional cross-sectional distribution of the eleven financial companies, we follow Oh and Patton (2013, 2017), and consider a skewed- t factor model

$$X_{i,t} = \alpha F_t + \varepsilon_{i,t}, \quad F_t \sim t(\zeta_1, \xi), \quad \varepsilon_{i,t} \sim t(\zeta_2, 0) \quad (5.26)$$

as a benchmark specification for the copula, against which the performance of the following competitor with estimable gold factor should be judged

$$\hat{X}_{i,t} = \alpha F_t + \beta \log|\hat{Z}_{t-1}| + \varepsilon_{i,t}, \quad F_t \sim t(\zeta_1, \xi), \quad \varepsilon_{i,t} \sim t(\zeta_2, 0). \quad (5.27)$$

⁴The p -value of a Wald test with Newey-West standard errors is about 0.91.

Table 5.1: Summary statistics and parameter estimates of margins

	BAC	BK	C	COF	GS	JPM	MET	MS	RF	USB	WFC	gold
Panel A												
mean	0.0523	0.0261	0.0266	0.0190	0.0161	0.0578	0.0040	0.0296	0.0373	0.0284	0.0117	0.0082
std	1.5717	1.3496	1.5199	1.4866	1.4343	1.2858	1.5346	1.6095	1.6742	1.1003	1.2589	0.7999
skewness	-0.2667	-0.7861	-0.3414	-0.7236	-0.2751	-0.075	-0.8395	-0.3446	-0.4046	-0.4024	-0.2700	0.2144
kurtosis	5.4706	7.8833	6.1669	11.0317	5.7947	6.0993	8.4726	5.7993	5.5505	5.1392	6.8976	5.2229
Panel B												
constant	0.0495	0.0336	0.0225	0.0317	0.0111	0.0553	0.0228	0.0386	0.0349	0.0245	0.0132	-
AR(1)	0.0076	-0.0076	0.0261	-0.0193	-0.0119	-0.0115	-0.0231	-0.009	0.0136	0.0019	-0.0338	-
gold	0.0161	0.0244	0.0487	0.0289	0.0413	0.0552	0.0239	0.0198	0.0109	0.0496	0.0161	-
constant	0.1992	0.1355	0.2069	0.1588	0.1093	0.1104	0.304	0.1726	0.18	0.0729	0.1242	0.0076
ARCH(1)	0.0202	0.0436	0.0266	0.0283	0.041	0.0259	0.0107	0.0259	0.0369	0.016	0.0488	0.0366
GARCH(1)	0.7851	0.8014	0.7838	0.8281	0.8409	0.7888	0.7433	0.8191	0.8232	0.8218	0.7814	0.9609
gold	0.2892	0.2053	0.2805	0.1674	0.1777	0.2377	0.3125	0.3101	0.2798	0.1146	0.1597	-
gold leverage	-0.2628	-0.1943	-0.3879	-0.2057	-0.2371	-0.2194	-0.2862	-0.3563	-0.2832	-0.1101	-0.1911	-
leverage	0.1651	0.1034	0.1786	0.1013	0.1051	0.1695	0.1348	0.108	0.0808	0.1465	0.145	-0.0120
ξ	-0.0141	-0.0831	-0.0342	-0.0598	-0.0672	-0.0001	-0.1092	-0.0402	-0.0905	-0.1276	-0.0476	0.0285
$1/\zeta$	5.0844	4.3193	4.7472	4.9983	5.6513	4.5262	4.5528	6.8202	7.5704	5.8055	5.8539	5.9754

Analogously to the Monte Carlo exercise, SMM estimation makes use of Spearman's rho and quantile dependence with $\tau \in \{0.15, 0.25, 0.35, 0.65, 0.75, 0.85\}$ for $S = 25$. The standard errors (3.18) are based on 1,000 bootstrap replications and numerical derivatives with tuning parameter set equal to $\pi_T = 0.05$.


The first two columns summarize the results for the benchmark models. Following Oh and Patton (2013, 2017), specification A1 imposes the restriction of a common (inverse) degrees of freedom parameter $\zeta_1 = \zeta_2$. The point estimates are in line with the values reported in Oh and Patton (2017, table 3) and suggest significant (negative) asymmetric dependence and significant tail dependence. However, specification A1 appears to be too restrictive as it is rejected by the data at the conventional five percent significance level. Allowing for $\zeta_1 \neq \zeta_2$ yields a considerable improvement in model fit with a p -value for the test of overidentifying restrictions of about 0.76. Again, we find significant evidence for left-skewness and tail dependence. The final two columns contain the results for our competitors with estimable factor; i.e., specification B1 augments model A2 with $\log|\hat{Z}_{t-1}|$ and specification B2 imposes the restriction $\xi = 0$. As can be deduced from the results of the overidentifying restrictions test (3.19), the specifications with estimable factor are not

rejected by the data and improve the performance of the benchmark models—thereby highlighting a significant effect of the estimable gold factor. Interestingly, conditionally on the estimable gold factor, the asymmetry parameter is no longer statistically significant different from zero. This can be explained by the fact that the estimable gold factor already accounts for asymmetry; an intuition supported by the fact that specification B2, imposing the symmetry restriction $\xi = 0$, yields the best fit.

Table 5.2: Copula parameter estimates

	A1		A2		w/ estimable factor			
	estimate	t-statistic	estimate	t-statistic	B1		B2	
ξ	-0.1248	-3.0038	-0.1307	-2.9461	0.0177	0.0603	-	-
ζ_1	0.1050	1.8758	0.1173	1.9339	0.2100	1.4842	0.1950	1.4937
ζ_2	-	-	0.3178	10.1502	0.3210	10.7143	0.3156	11.3642
α	1.8374	36.9025	1.5613	16.1614	1.2403	2.8285	1.2612	8.3824
β	-	-	-	-	0.8453	2.3020	0.8294	6.7581
J	0.4710		0.0417		0.0163		0.0160	
p-value	0.031		0.760		0.725		0.951	


Figure 5.1: Histogram and time-series plot of $\log|\hat{Z}_t|$



To illustrate, Figure 5.1 shows the distribution of the logarithmic absolute residuals, which is seen to be left-skewed; for comparison, the density of $\log|Z_t^*|$, $Z_t^* \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, is depicted as the solid

line in panel A.⁵ Finally, Figure 5.2 illustrates how accurately the quantile dependence functions implied by the factor copulae approximate the empirical data. All specifications fit the upper and lower tail of the empirical distribution fairly well, with the exception of model A1 that fails to capture the lower tail.

Figure 5.2: Empirical and fitted quantile dependence



6 Conclusion

We derive the asymptotic properties of an SMM estimator of the unknown parameter vector governing a factor copula model with estimable factors and show how to estimate its limiting variance-covariance matrix consistently. A natural extension of the above is a factor model with ‘observation-driven’ loadings similar to that considered by Oh and Patton (2018) and Opschoor *et al.* (2020); i.e., $X_{i,t} = \alpha(W_t, \nu)F_t + \varepsilon_{i,t}$, where W_t is an observable covariate and $\nu \mapsto \alpha(\cdot, \nu)$ is a parametric function known up to ν . Indeed, if W_t is ergodic, most of the asymptotic theory retains

⁵If $Z^* \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, then $Z := \log|Z^*|$ has absolutely continuous density f

$$f(z) := \sqrt{\frac{2 \exp\{2z - \exp\{2z\}\}}{\pi}}, \quad z \in \mathbb{R},$$

with mean $\mathbb{E}[Z] = (-\gamma - \log 2)/2$ and variance $\text{var}[Z] = \pi^2/8$, where $\gamma \approx 0.5772$ is the Euler-Mascheroni constant. The density given by the preceding display is depicted as the solid line in Figure 5.1. As a ‘robustness-check’, we also estimate a variant of model B1, where $Z_t := \log|Z_t^*|$, $Z_t^* \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, is simulable. However, the data rejects this specification with a p -value for the test of overidentifying restrictions of about 0.029.

its validity also in this case. Another avenue that can be pursued is to consider a Laplace-type estimator to alleviate the difficulties of having to deal with a non-smooth objective function; see, e.g., Hong *et al.* (2021) for a recent application of this idea.

References

- Akritis, M. G., and I. Van Keilegom (2001). Non-parametric estimation of the residual distribution. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 28, 549–567. doi:10.1111/1467-9469.00254
- Andrews, D. W. K., and D. Pollard (1994). An introduction to functional central limit theorems for dependent stochastic processes. *International Statistical Review* 62, 119–132. doi:10.2307/1403549
- Baur, D. G., and T. K. McDermott (2010). Is gold a safe haven? International evidence. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 34, 1886–1898. doi:10.1016/j.jbankfin.2009.12.008
- Berghaus, B., A. Bücher, and S. Volgushev (2017). Weak convergence of the empirical copula process with respect to weighted metrics. *Bernoulli* 23, 743–772. doi:10.3150/15-BEJ751
- Bernanke, B. S., J. Boivin, P. Elias (2005). Measuring the effects of monetary policy: a factor-augmented vector autoregressive (FAVAR) approach. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 120, 387–422. doi:10.1162/0033553053327452
- Boivin, J., M. P. Giannoni, and I. Mihov (2009). Sticky prices and monetary policy: evidence from disaggregated US data. *American Economic Review* 99, 350–384. doi:10.1257/aer.99.1.350
- Bollerslev, T., R. F. Engle, and D. B. Nelson (1994). *ARCH Model*. in: Engle, R. F., and D. McFadden (Eds.), *Handbook of Econometrics*, 4, Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Brown, D. J., and M. H. Wegkamp (2002). Weighted minimum mean square distance from independence estimation. *Econometrica* 70, 2035–2051. doi:10.1111/1468-0262.00362

- Bücher, A., and S. Volgushev (2013). Empirical and sequential empirical copula processes under serial dependence. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 119, 61–70. doi:10.1016/j.jmva.2013.04.003
- Bücher, A., and J. Segers (2013). Extreme value copula estimation based on block maxima of a multivariate stationary time series. *Extremes* 17, 495–528. doi:10.1007/s10687-014-0195-8
- Caporale, G. M., C., Ntantamis, T., Pantelidis, and N. Pittis (2005). The BDS Test as a Test for the Adequacy of a GARCH(1,1) Specification: A Monte Carlo Study. *Journal of Financial Econometrics* 3, 282–309. doi:10.1093/jjfinec/nbi010
- Chen, X., O. Linton, and I. Van Keilegom (2003). Estimation of semiparametric models when the criterion function is not smooth. *Econometrica* 71, 1591–1608. doi:10.1111/1468-0262.00461
- Chen, X., and Y. Fan (2006). Estimation and model selection of semiparametric copula-based multivariate dynamic models under copula misspecification. *Journal of Econometrics* 135, 125–154. doi:10.1016/j.jeconom.2005.07.027
- Chen, X., Z. Huang, and Y. Yi (2020). Efficient estimation of multivariate semi-nonparametric GARCH filtered copula models. *Journal of Econometrics*. doi:10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.07.012
- Cheng, G. (2015). Moment consistency of the exchangeably weighted bootstrap for semiparametric M-estimation. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*. 42, 665–684. doi:10.1111/sjos.12128
- Côté, M.-P., C. Genest, and M. Omelka (2019). Rank-based inference tools for copula regression, with property and casualty insurance applications. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 89, 1–15. doi:j.insmatheco.2019.08.001
- Creal, D. D., S. J. Koopman, and A. Lucas (2013). Generalized autoregressive score models with applications. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 28, 777–795. doi:10.1002/jae.1279
- Creal, D. D., and R. S. Tsay (2015). High dimensional dynamic stochastic copula models. *Journal of Econometrics* 189, 335–345. doi:10.1016/j.jeconom.2015.03.027

- D'Errico, J. (2021). `fminsearchbnd`, `fminsearchcon`. *MATLAB Central File Exchange* Retrieved April 17, 2021.
- Dette, H., J. C. Pardo-Fernández, and V. I. Keilegom (2009). Goodness-of-fit tests for multiplicative models with dependent data. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 36, 782–799. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9469.2009.00648.x
- Doukhan, P., P. Massart, and E. Rio (1995). Invariance principles for absolutely regular empirical processes. *Annales de l'I.H.P-Probabilités et statistiques* 31, 393–427.
- Fan, Y., and A. J. Patton (2014). Copulas in econometrics. *Annual Review of Economics* 6, 179–200. doi:10.1146/annurev-economics-080213-041221
- Fermanian, J.-D., D. Radulović, and M. H. Wegkamp (2004). Weak convergence of empirical copula processes. *Bernoulli* 10, 847–860. doi:10.3150/bj/1099579158
- Franco, C., and J.-M. Zakoïan (2004). Maximum likelihood estimation of pure GARCH and ARMA-GARCH processes. *Bernoulli* 4, 605–637. doi:10.3150/bj/1093265632
- Genest, C., K. Ghoudi, and B. Rémillard (2007). Rank-Based Extensions of the Brock, Dechert, and Scheinkman Test. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 102, 1363–1376. doi:10.1198/016214507000001076
- Giné, E., and J. Zinn (1990). Bootstrapping general empirical measures. *Annals of Probability* 18, 851–869. doi:10.1214/aop/1176990862
- Gonçalves, S., U. Hounyo, A. J. Patton, and K. Sheppard (2019). Bootstrapping two-stage quasi-maximum likelihood estimators of time series models. *Working paper*
- Gouriéroux, C., and A. Monfort (1997). *Simulation-based Econometric Methods*. CORE Lectures. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hansen, B. (1994). Autoregressive conditional density estimation. *International Economic Review* 35, 705–730. doi:10.2307/2527081.

- Hong, H., H. Li, and J. Li, (2021). BLP estimation using Laplace transformation and overlapping simulation draws. *Journal of Econometrics* 222, 56–72. doi:10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.07.026.
- Kosorok, M. R. (2008). *Introduction to Empirical Processes and Semiparametric Inference*, Springer Series in Statistics, Berlin: Springer.
- Krupskii, P. and H. Joe (2013). Factor copula models for multivariate data. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 120, 85–101. doi:10.1016/j.jmva.2013.05.001.
- Krupskii, P. and H. Joe (2020). Flexible copula models with dynamic dependence and application to financial data. *Econometrics and Statistics* 16, 148–167. doi:10.1016/j.ecosta.2020.01.00.
- Lee, J. F. (1992). On efficiency of methods of simulated moments and maximum simulated likelihood estimation of discrete response models. *Econometric Theory* 8, 518–552. doi:10.1017/S0266466600013207
- Manner, H., F. Stark, and D. Wied (2019). Testing for structural breaks in factor copula models. *Journal of Econometrics* 208, 324–345. doi:10.1016/j.jeconom.2018.10.001.
- Manner, H., F. Stark, and D. Wied (forthcoming). A monitoring procedure for detecting structural breaks in factor copula models. *Studies in Nonlinear Dynamics & Econometrics* doi:10.1515/sn-de-2019-0081.
- McFadden, D. (1989). A method of simulated moments for estimation of discrete response models without numerical integration. *Econometrica* 57, 995–1026. doi:10.2307/1913621
- Neumeyer, N., M. Omelka, and Š. Hudecová (2019). A copula approach for dependence modeling in multivariate nonparametric time series. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 171, 139–162. doi:10.1016/j.jmva.2018.11.016
- Newey, W. K., and D. McFadden (1994). Large sample estimation and hypothesis testing, *in Handbook of Econometrics* 4, ed by R. Engle and D. McFadden. Amsterdam: North Holland, 2113–2247. doi:10.1016/S1573-4412(05)80005-4

- Oh, D. H., and A. J. Patton (2013). Simulated method of moments estimation for copula-based multivariate models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 108, 689–700. doi:10.1080/01621459.2013.785952
- Oh, D. H., and A. J. Patton (2017). Modeling dependence in high dimensions with factor copulas. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 35, 139–154. doi:10.1080/07350015.2015.1062384
- Oh, D. H., and A. J. Patton (2018). Time-varying systemic risk: evidence from a dynamic copula model of CDS spreads. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 36, 181–195. doi:10.1080/07350015.2016.1177535
- Oh, D. H., and A. J. Patton (2021). Factor copula models with estimated cluster assignments. *Finance and Economics Discussion Series 2021-029*, Washington: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. doi:doi.org/10.17016/FEDS.2021.029
- Omelka, M., N. Neumeier, and Š. Hudecová (2020). Maximum pseudo-likelihood estimation based on estimated residuals in copula semiparametric models. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 1–41. doi:10.1111/sjos.12498
- Opschoor, A., Lucas, A, Barra, I., and van Dijk, D. (2020). Closed-form multi-factor copula models with observation-driven dynamic factor loadings. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* doi:10.1080/07350015.2020.1763806
- Pakes, A., and D. Pollard (1989). Simulation and the asymptotics of optimization estimators. *Econometrica* 57, 1027–1057. doi:10.2307/1913622
- Patton, A. (2006). Modelling asymmetric exchange rate dependence. *International Economic Review* 47, 527–556. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2354.2006.00387.x
- Radulović, D., Wegkamp, M., and Y. Zhao (2017). Weak convergence of empirical copula processes indexed by functions. *Bernoulli* 23, 3346–3384. doi:10.3150/16-BEJ849

- Rémillard, B. (2017). Goodness-of-fit tests for copulas of multivariate time series. *econometrics* 5, 1–23. doi:10.3390/econometrics5010013
- Resnick, S. (1999). *A Probability Path*. World Publishing Corporation.
- Segers, J. (2012). Asymptotics of empirical copula processes under nonrestrictive smoothness assumptions. *Bernoulli* 18, 764–782. doi:10.3150/11-BEJ387
- Stock, J. H., and M. W. Watson (2005). Implications of dynamic factor models for VAR analysis. *NBER Working Paper 11467*. doi:10.3386/w11467
- Tsukahara, H. (2005). Semiparametric estimation in copula models. *Canadian Journal of Statistics* 33, 357–375. doi:10.1002/cjs.5540330304
- van der Vaart, A. W. (1994). *Asymptotic Statistics*, Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van der Vaart, A. W., and J. A. Wellner (1996). *Weak convergence and empirical processes*. New York: Springer.
- White, H. (2001). *Asymptotic Theory for Econometricians*, 2nd ed., Bingley: Emerald.

A Technical appendix

Preliminaries: To begin with, suppose $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, with $q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$. Next, define the empirical copulae

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu) \\ := \frac{1}{TS} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^S 1\{\hat{X}_{i,t,s}(\theta_q, \nu) \leq \hat{G}_{T,S,i}^-(u_i; \theta_q, \nu), \hat{X}_{j,t,s}(\theta_q, \nu) \leq \hat{G}_{T,S,j}^-(u_j; \theta_q, \nu)\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and

$$\hat{C}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T 1\{\hat{\eta}_{i,t}(\lambda_i) \leq \hat{F}_{T,i}^-(u_i; \lambda_i), \hat{\eta}_{j,t}(\lambda_j) \leq \hat{F}_{T,j}^-(u_j; \lambda_j)\}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $\theta_q = (\alpha'_q, \beta'_q, \gamma', \delta')' \in \Theta$, $u_i, u_j \in [0, 1]$, $\nu = (\nu'_1, \dots, \nu'_{p_\beta})' \in \mathcal{V}_T$, with $\mathcal{V}_T = \cup_{j=1}^{p_\beta} \mathcal{V}_{T,j}$, $j = 1, \dots, p_\beta$, and $\lambda_i \in \Lambda_{T,i}$, $\lambda_j \in \Lambda_{T,j}$; see assumption E for the definitions of $\mathcal{V}_{T,j}$ and $\Lambda_{T,j}$.

Below, we make frequently use of the identities [see, e.g., Tsukahara (2005) and Segers (2012)]:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu) &= \tilde{C}_{T,S,i,j}\{\tilde{C}_{T,S,i}^-(u_i; \theta_q, \nu), \tilde{C}_{T,S,j}^-(u_j; \theta_q, \nu); \theta_q, \nu\} \\ \hat{C}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) &= \tilde{C}_{T,i,j}\{\tilde{C}_{T,i}^-(u_i; \lambda_i), \tilde{C}_{T,j}^-(u_j; \lambda_j); \lambda_i, \lambda_j\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{C}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu) &:= \frac{1}{TS} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^S 1\{\hat{X}_{i,t,s}(\theta_q, \nu) \leq G_q^{-1}(u_i; \theta_q), \hat{X}_{j,t,s}(\theta_q, \nu) \leq G_q^{-1}(u_j; \theta_q)\} \\ \tilde{C}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) &:= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T 1\{\hat{\eta}_{i,t}(\lambda_i) \leq F_i^{-1}(u_i), \hat{\eta}_{j,t}(\lambda_j) \leq F_j^{-1}(u_j)\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

and $\tilde{C}_{T,S,k}(u_i; \theta_q, \nu) = \tilde{C}_{T,S,i,j}(\vec{u}_k; \theta_q, \nu)$, $\tilde{C}_{T,k}(u_k; \lambda_k) = \tilde{C}_{T,i,j}(\vec{u}_k; \lambda_i, \lambda_j)$ for $k \in \{i, j\}$, with $\vec{u}_i = (u_i, 1)'$, $\vec{u}_j = (1, u_j)'$. Moreover, define the uncentered processes

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu) &:= \sqrt{T}(\hat{C}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu) - C_q(u_i, u_j; \theta_q)) \\ \hat{C}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) &:= \sqrt{T}(\hat{C}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) - C_q(u_i, u_j)), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

and the centered processes

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{C}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu) &:= \sqrt{T}(\hat{C}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu) - E[\hat{C}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu)]) \\ \tilde{C}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) &:= \sqrt{T}(\hat{C}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) - E[\hat{C}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j)]). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

A.1 Proof of proposition 1

Proof of proposition 1 (a): Recall the definition of the population rank statistics from equation (3.11) and note that

$$\psi_{q,k} = \int_{[0,1]^2} \varphi_k(u_i, u_j) dC_q(u_i, u_j), \quad \psi_{q,k}(\theta) = \int_{[0,1]^2} \varphi_k(u_i, u_j) dC_q(u_i, u_j; \theta_q)$$

for any $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$, $q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$. Hence, one gets, in view of lemma B.3 and lemma B.4, the following representation

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\psi}_{T,i,j,k}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) - \psi_{q,k}) = \int_{[0,1]^2} \hat{C}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j) d\varphi_k(u_i, u_j) + o_p(1), \quad (\text{A.7})$$

with $\hat{C}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j) := \sqrt{T}(\hat{C}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j) - C_q(u_i, u_j))$, and, uniformly in $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\psi}_{T,S,i,j,k}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T) - \psi_{q,k}(\theta)) = \int_{[0,1]^2} \hat{C}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q) d\varphi_k(u_i, u_j) + o_p(1) \quad (\text{A.8})$$

with $\hat{C}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q) := \sqrt{T}(\hat{C}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q) - C_q(u_i, u_j; \theta_q))$, $\hat{C}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j) := \hat{C}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_{0,i}, \lambda_{0,j})$, $\hat{C}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q) := \hat{C}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta, \nu_0)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) &:= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T 1\{\hat{\eta}_{i,t}(\lambda_i) \leq \hat{F}_{T,i}^-(u_i; \lambda_i), \hat{\eta}_{j,t}(\lambda_j) \leq \hat{F}_{T,j}^-(u_j; \lambda_j)\} \\ \hat{C}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu) &:= \frac{1}{TS} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^S 1\{\hat{X}_{k,t,s}(\theta_q, \nu) \leq G_q^{-1}(u_i; \theta_q), \hat{X}_{k,t,s}(\theta_q, \nu) \leq G_q^{-1}(u_j; \theta_q)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the claim is due to the weak convergence of $\hat{C}_{T,i,j}$ and $\hat{C}_{T,S,i,j}$. To see this, note that the functional delta method [cf. van der Vaart and Wellner (1996, theorem 3.9.4)] in conjunction with assumption C and Bücher and Volgushev (2013, theorem 2.4.) yields

$$\hat{C}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) = \tilde{C}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j) - \sum_{k \in \{i,j\}} \partial_k C_q(u_i, u_j) \tilde{C}_{T,i,j}(\vec{u}_k) + R(u_i, u_j), \quad (\text{A.9})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q) &= \tilde{C}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q) \\ &\quad - \sum_{k \in \{i,j\}} \partial_k C_q(u_i, u_j; \theta_q) \tilde{C}_{T,S,i,j}(\vec{u}_k; \theta_q) + R_1(u_i, u_j; \theta_q), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where $\sup_{u_i, u_j \in [0,1]} |R(u_i, u_j)| = o_p(1)$, $\sup_{\theta_q \in \Theta} \sup_{u_i, u_j \in [0,1]} |R_1(u_i, u_j; \theta_q)| = o_p(1)$, and $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j) := \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_{0,i}, \lambda_{0,j})$, $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q) := \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu_0)$; see equation (A.6). The claim follows from lemma B.1 and lemma B.2.

Proof of proposition 1 (b): Taking equation (3.15), lemma B.3, and lemma B.4 into account, one gets

$$\sqrt{T} \hat{\Psi}_{T,S,i,j,k}(\theta_q, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T) = \int_{[0,1]^2} \hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j) d\varphi_k(u_i, u_j) + o_p(1), \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where $\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j) := \hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_{0,q}, \lambda_{0,i}, \lambda_{0,j}, \nu_0)$. We show next that $\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}$ converges weakly to the tight Gaussian process \mathbb{B}_S by establishing (1) asymptotic tightness and (2) finite dimensional (*'fidi'*, henceforth) convergence. (1) Stochastic equicontinuity: The functional delta method yields

$$\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j) = \tilde{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j) - \sum_{k \in \{i,j\}} \partial_k \mathbb{C}_q(u_i, u_j) \tilde{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(\vec{u}_k) + o_p(1), \quad (\text{A.12})$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S (1\{V_{i,t} \leq u_i, V_{j,t} \leq u_j\} - 1\{U_{i,t,s} \leq u_i, U_{j,t,s} \leq u_j\}), \quad (\text{A.13})$$

with $V_{k,t} := \mathbb{F}_k(\eta_{k,t})$, $U_{k,t,s} := \mathbb{G}_q(X_{k,t,s}(\theta_{0,q}); \theta_{0,q})$ for $k \in \{i, j\}$. Let $\xi_{i,j,t,S} = (V_{i,t}, V_{j,t}, \mathbf{U}'_{S:i,j,t})'$, with $\mathbf{U}_{S:i,j,t} := (U_{i,t,1}, U_{j,t,1}, \dots, U_{i,t,S}, U_{j,t,S})'$. We can view $\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}$ as an empirical process indexed by $\bar{f} \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}$:

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}} := \{\xi_{S:i,j,t} \mapsto \bar{f}(\xi_{S:i,j,t}) := \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S (f(V_{i,t}, V_{j,t}) - f(U_{i,t,s}, U_{j,t,s})) : f \in \mathcal{F}\}, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

where $\mathcal{F} := \{(x_1, x_2) \mapsto 1\{x_1 \leq u_1, x_2 \leq u_2\}, u_1, u_2 \in [0, 1]\}$. Clearly, $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ has envelope 1. We use theorem B.1 below to establish asymptotic equicontinuity. Specifically, the bracketing number $\mathcal{N}_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \rho(\cdot))$, with $\rho(\bar{f}) := \sup_{t,T} \|\bar{f}(\xi_{i,j,t,S})\|_2$, shall be determined; see the discussion surrounding theorem B.1 for details. It is well-known [see, e.g, van der Vaart (1994, example 19.6)] that $\mathcal{N}_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}_k, \|\cdot\|_2) = O(\epsilon^{-2})$, with $\mathcal{F}_k := \{x_k \mapsto 1\{x_k \leq u_k\}, u_k \in [0, 1]\}$. Since $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \cdot \mathcal{F}_2$, one gets $\mathcal{N}_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_2) = O(\epsilon^{-4})$; see, e.g., Kosorok (2008, lemma 9.25). Suppose $[l_k, u_k]$, $k =$

$1, \dots, m := \mathcal{N}_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_2)$, represent the brackets needed to cover \mathcal{F} . We can then cover $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ with $[\bar{l}_k, \bar{u}_k]$, $k = 1, \dots, m$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{l}_k(\xi_{S:i,j,t}) &:= \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S (l_k(V_{i,t}, V_{j,t}) - u_k(U_{i,t,s}, U_{j,t,s})) \\ \bar{u}_k(\xi_{S:i,j,t}) &:= \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S (u_k(V_{i,t}, V_{j,t}) - l_k(U_{i,t,s}, U_{j,t,s})).\end{aligned}\tag{A.15}$$

Note, that $\rho(\bar{u}_k - \bar{l}_k) \leq 2\epsilon$. Thus, $\mathcal{N}_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \rho(\cdot)) = O(\epsilon^{-4})$. Now, since $\{\xi_{i,j,t,S} : t \geq 1\}$ is *i.i.d.* and $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ is uniformly bounded, the conditions of theorem B.1 are satisfied. (2) ‘Fidi’-convergence: By the Cramér-Wold device [see, e.g., White (2001, proposition 5.1)], it suffices to fix some $c := (c_1, \dots, c_m)' \in \mathbb{R}^m$, with $\|c\| = 1$, $(\{u_1, v_1\} \dots, \{u_m, v_m\})' \in [0, 1]^{2m}$, and to consider

$$Z_{T,S,i,j}(m) := \sum_{l=1}^m c_l \tilde{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_l, v_l) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T B_{S:i,j,t}(m),\tag{A.16}$$

where $B_{S:i,j,t}(m) := \sum_{l=1}^m c_l \zeta_{S:i,j,t}(u_l, v_l)$, with

$$\zeta_{S:i,j,t}(u_l, v_l) := 1\{V_{i,t} \leq u_l, V_{j,t} \leq v_l\} - \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S 1\{U_{i,t,s} \leq u_l, U_{j,t,s} \leq v_l\}.\tag{A.17}$$

The sequence $\{B_{S:i,j,t}(m) : t \geq 1\}$ is *i.i.d.*, bounded, and, by assumption A, centered. It thus follows from White (2001, theorem 5.11) that $Z_{T,S,i,j}(m) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_S^2(m))$, with $\sigma_S^2(m) := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{T,S}^2(m)$, provided $\inf_{T,S \geq 1} \sigma_{T,S}^2(m) > 0$ for $\sigma_{T,S}^2(m) := \text{var}[Z_{T,S,i,j}(m)]$. Now,

$$\sigma_{T,S}^2(m) = \sum_{k,l=1}^m c_k c_l \hat{\gamma}_{T,S,i,j}(k, l), \quad \hat{\gamma}_{T,S,i,j}(k, l) := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t,h=1}^T \text{cov}[\zeta_{S:i,j,t}(w_k), \zeta_{S:i,j,h}(w_l)],\tag{A.18}$$

where $w_j := (u_j, v_j)' \in [0, 1]^2$, $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Since, $\{\zeta_{S:i,j,t}(w_k) : t \geq 1\}$ is *i.i.d.*, one gets

$$\hat{\gamma}_{T,S,i,j}(k, l) = \text{cov}[\zeta_{S:i,j,1}(w_k), \zeta_{S:i,j,1}(w_l)].\tag{A.19}$$

Next, for any $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$, $q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$, one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{cov}[\zeta_{S:i,j,1}(w_k), \zeta_{S:i,j,1}(w_l) \mid Z_1] \\
&= \text{cov}[1\{V_{i,1} \leq u_k, V_{j,1} \leq v_k\}, 1\{V_{i,1} \leq u_l, V_{j,1} \leq v_l\} \mid Z_1] \\
&\quad - \sum_{s=1}^S (\text{cov}[1\{V_{i,1} \leq u_k, V_{j,1} \leq v_k\}, 1\{U_{i,1,1} \leq u_l, U_{j,1,1} \leq v_l\} \mid Z_1] \\
&\quad\quad + \text{cov}[1\{U_{i,1,s} \leq u_k, U_{j,1,s} \leq v_k\}, 1\{V_{i,1} \leq u_l, V_{j,1} \leq v_l\} \mid Z_1]) / S \\
&\quad + \sum_{s,r=1}^S \text{cov}[1\{U_{i,1,s} \leq u_k, U_{j,1,s} \leq v_k\}, 1\{U_{i,1,r} \leq u_l, U_{j,1,r} \leq v_l\} \mid Z_1] / S^2 \\
&= \text{cov}[1\{V_{i,1} \leq u_k, V_{j,1} \leq v_k\}, 1\{V_{i,1} \leq u_l, V_{j,1} \leq v_l\} \mid Z_1] \\
&\quad + \text{cov}[1\{U_{i,1,1} \leq u_k, U_{j,1,1} \leq v_k\}, 1\{U_{i,1,1} \leq u_l, U_{j,1,1} \leq v_l\} \mid Z_1] / S \\
&= \mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u_k \wedge u_l, v_k \wedge v_l) - \mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u_k, v_k) \mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u_l, v_l) \\
&\quad + [\mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u_k \wedge u_l, v_k \wedge v_l; \theta_{q,0}) - \mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u_k, v_k; \theta_{q,0}) \mathcal{C}_{q,t}(u_l, v_l; \theta_{q,0})] / S,
\end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate equality uses that $V_{i,t} \perp U_{i,t,s} \mid Z_t$ and $U_{i,t,r} \perp U_{i,t,s} \mid Z_t$, $r \neq s$. Since $\text{E}[\zeta_{S:i,j,1}(w_l) \mid Z_1] = \mathcal{C}_{q,1}(w_k) - \mathcal{C}_{q,1}(w_k; \theta_{q,0})$, we get, by the law of total covariance,

$$\text{cov}[\zeta_{S:i,j,1}(w_k), \zeta_{S:i,j,1}(w_l)] = \gamma_{q,S}(k, l),$$

and, by assumption F, $\sigma_{T,S}^2(m) = c' \Gamma_{q,m,SC} > 0$. Therefore, combining (1) and (2) yields $\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(u, v) \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{C}_{q,S}(u, v)$, so that

$$\sqrt{T} \hat{\Psi}_{T,S,i,j,k}(\theta, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{0,S}(q, q \mid k, k)),$$

with

$$\sigma_{0,S}(q, q \mid k, k) := \int_{[0,1]^2} \int_{[0,1]^2} \text{E}[\mathbb{C}_{q,S}(u_1, v_1) \mathbb{C}_{q,S}(u_2, v_2)] \text{d}\varphi_k(u_1, v_1) \text{d}\varphi_k(u_2, v_2);$$

see also Berghaus *et al.* (2017, theorem 3.3). To conclude from here, use that $\{\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j) : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$ are jointly normal as $T \rightarrow \infty$. To see this, note that $\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j) = \hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S}(\vec{u}_{i,j})$, where $\vec{u}_{i,j}$ denotes the n -dimensional vector of ones with u_i (u_j) at i -th (j -th) position and

$\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S}(u_1, \dots, u_n) = \hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S}(u_1, \dots, u_n; \theta_0, \lambda_0, \nu_0)$, with $\lambda_0 := (\lambda'_{0,1}, \dots, \lambda'_{0,n})'$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S}(u_1, \dots, u_n; \theta, \lambda, \nu) \\ & := \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T [1\{\hat{\eta}_{1,t}(\lambda_1) \leq F_{1,T}^-(u_1; \lambda_1), \dots, \hat{\eta}_{n,t}(\lambda_n) \leq F_{n,T}^-(u_n; \lambda_n)\} \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S 1\{\hat{X}_{1,t,s}(d_1, \hat{\nu}_T) \leq G_1^{-1}(u_1; d_1, \nu), \dots, \hat{X}_{n,t,s}(d_n, \nu) \leq G_n^{-1}(u_n; d_n, \nu)\}], \end{aligned}$$

with $\lambda = (\lambda'_1, \dots, \lambda'_n)' \in \cup_{i=1}^n \Lambda_{T,i}$. Weak convergence of $\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S}(u_1, \dots, u_n)$ follows by the same arguments used to establish weak convergence of $\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j)$. Since n is finite, the claim follows.

Proof of proposition 1 (c): Note that we can restrict the event inside the probability to the case where $\hat{\nu}_T = (\hat{\nu}'_{T,1}, \dots, \hat{\nu}'_{T,p_\alpha})' \in \mathcal{V}_T = \cup_{j=1}^{p_\alpha} \mathcal{V}_{T,j}$. To see this, recall from assumption E that $\sqrt{T}\|\hat{\nu}_T - \nu_0\| = O_p(1)$; i.e. there exists some constant $K_\nu := K_\nu(\epsilon) < \infty$ such that $\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\nu}_T \notin \mathcal{V}_T) < \epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{\theta, \tilde{\theta} \in \Theta: \|\theta - \tilde{\theta}\| \leq \delta} \sqrt{T} \|\hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\theta, \hat{\nu}_T) - \psi(\theta) - \hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\nu}_T) + \psi(\tilde{\theta})\| > \eta \right] \\ & \leq \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\nu}_T \notin \mathcal{V}_T) \\ & \quad + \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta: \|\theta - \tilde{\theta}\| \leq \delta} \sqrt{T} \|\hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\theta, \nu_T) - \psi(\theta) - \hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\tilde{\theta}, \nu_T) + \psi(\tilde{\theta})\| > \eta, \hat{\nu}_T \in \mathcal{V}_T \right] \\ & \leq \epsilon + \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}_T, \theta, \tilde{\theta} \in \Theta: \|\theta - \tilde{\theta}\| \leq \delta} \sqrt{T} \|\hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\theta, \nu) - \psi(\theta) - \hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\tilde{\theta}, \nu) + \psi(\tilde{\theta})\| > \eta \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since, by lemma B.3 and lemma B.4, one has

$$\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}_T} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sqrt{T} \|\hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\theta, \nu) - \hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\theta, \nu_0)\| > \eta \right] < \epsilon,$$

it suffices to show that

$$\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{\theta, \tilde{\theta} \in \Theta: \|\theta - \tilde{\theta}\| \leq \delta} \sqrt{T} \|\hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\theta, \nu_0) - \psi(\theta) - \hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\tilde{\theta}, \nu_0) + \psi(\tilde{\theta})\| > \eta \right] < \epsilon. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

To begin with, recall that $\theta_q = (\alpha'_q, \beta'_q, \gamma', \delta')'$, $q = 1, \dots, Q$. Thus, by a slight abuse of notation,

$\theta = (\alpha'_1, \beta'_1, \dots, \alpha'_Q, \beta'_Q, \gamma', \delta')' = \cup_{q=1}^Q \theta_q$. Therefore, by the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\theta, \nu_0) - \psi(\theta) - \hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\tilde{\theta}, \nu_0) + \psi(\tilde{\theta})\| \\ & \leq \sum_{q=1}^Q \frac{1}{\binom{|\mathcal{G}_q|}{2}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < j \leq n \\ i, j \in \mathcal{G}_q}} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} |\hat{\psi}_{T,S,i,j,k}(\theta_q, \nu_0) - \psi_{q,k}(\theta_q) - \hat{\psi}_{T,S,i,j,k}(\tilde{\theta}_q, \nu_0) + \psi_{q,k}(\tilde{\theta}_q)|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{\theta, \tilde{\theta} \in \Theta: \|\theta - \tilde{\theta}\| \leq \delta} \sqrt{T} \|\hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\theta, \nu_0) - \psi(\theta) - \hat{\psi}_{T,S}(\tilde{\theta}, \nu_0) + \psi(\tilde{\theta})\| > \eta \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{q=1}^Q \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < j \leq n \\ i, j \in \mathcal{G}_q}} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{\theta_q, \tilde{\theta}_q \in \Theta: \|\theta - \tilde{\theta}\| \leq \delta} |\hat{\psi}_{T,S,i,j,k}(\theta_q, \nu_0) - \psi_{q,k}(\theta_q) \right. \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. - \hat{\psi}_{T,S,i,j,k}(\tilde{\theta}_q, \nu_0) + \psi_{q,k}(\tilde{\theta}_q)| > \frac{\eta}{Q\ell} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now, suppose $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$ for some $q = 1, \dots, Q$. Moreover, let us recall from equation (A.8) that uniformly in $\theta_q \in \Theta$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{T} |\hat{\psi}_{T,S,i,j,k}(\theta_q, \nu_0) - \psi_{q,k}(\theta_q)| \\ & \leq \left| \int_{[0,1]^2} d\varphi_k(u_i, u_j) \right| \sup_{u_i, u_j \in [0,1]} |\hat{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j,T,S}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q)| + |R(\theta_q)| \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.21})$$

for $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, where $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |R(\theta_q)| = o_p(1)$. Since n and ℓ are fix, we are left with showing that for any $\epsilon, \eta > 0$, there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{\theta_q, \tilde{\theta}_q \in \Theta: \|\theta_q - \tilde{\theta}_q\| \leq \delta} \sup_{u_i, u_j \in [0,1]} |\hat{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q) - \hat{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \tilde{\theta}_q)| > \eta \right] < \epsilon. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

In view of equation (A.3) and (A.4), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q) &= \sqrt{T} (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j} \{ \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i}^-(u_i; \theta_q), \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,j}^-(u_j; \theta_q); \theta_q \} - \mathbb{C}_{i,j} \{ \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i}^-(u_i; \theta_q), \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,j}^-(u_j; \theta_q); \theta_q \}) \\ & \quad + \sqrt{T} (\mathbb{C}_{i,j} \{ \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i}^-(u_i; \theta_q), \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,j}^-(u_j; \theta_q); \theta_q \} - \mathbb{C}_q(u_i, u_j)). \end{aligned}$$

with $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q) := \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta, \nu_0)$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,k}^-(u_k; \theta_q) := \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,k}^-(u_k; \theta_q, \nu_0)$ for $k \in \{i, j\}$.

Therefore, using an argument similar that in Tsukahara (2005, appendix B), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{\theta_q, \tilde{\theta}_q \in \Theta: \|\theta_q - \tilde{\theta}_q\| \leq \delta} \sup_{u_i, u_j \in [0,1]} |\hat{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q) - \hat{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \tilde{\theta}_q)| > \eta \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{\theta_q, \tilde{\theta}_q \in \Theta: \|\theta_q - \tilde{\theta}_q\| \leq \delta} \sup_{u_i, u_j \in [0,1]} |\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q) - \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \tilde{\theta}_q)| > \frac{\eta}{2} \right] \\
& \quad + \sum_{k \in \{i,j\}} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{\theta_q, \tilde{\theta}_q \in \Theta: \|\theta_q - \tilde{\theta}_q\| \leq \delta} \sup_{u_k \in [0,1]} |\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j}(\tilde{u}_k; \theta_q) - \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j}(\tilde{u}_k; \tilde{\theta}_q)| > \frac{\eta}{4} \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{A.23}$$

The claim thus follows from part (c) of lemma B.2.

A.2 Proof of corollary 1

Proof of corollary 1: As argued in Cheng (2015, lemma 1), it suffices to show that the conditional distribution of $\sqrt{T}(\hat{\Psi}_{T,S}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T) - \hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T))$ converges in probability to the limiting distribution of $\sqrt{T}\hat{\Psi}_{T,S}(\theta_0, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T)$ given in proposition 1. Specifically, define for any $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, with $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$, $q = 1, \dots, Q$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{T}(\hat{\Psi}_{T,S,i,j}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T) - \hat{\Psi}_{T,S,i,j}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T)) \\
& = \hat{\xi}_{T,S,i,j}^{(b)}(\theta_{0,q}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T) \\
& \quad + \hat{\xi}_{T,S,i,j}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T) - \hat{\xi}_{i,j,T,S}^{(b)}(\theta_{0,q}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\xi}_{T,S,i,j}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T) & := \sqrt{T}(\hat{\Psi}_{T,S,i,j}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T) \\
& \quad - \hat{\Psi}_{i,j,T,S}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T))
\end{aligned} \tag{A.24}$$

represents the bootstrap analog of

$$\hat{\xi}_{T,S,i,j}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T) = \sqrt{T}(\hat{\Psi}_{T,S,i,j}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T) - \Psi_{T,S,i,j}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q})). \tag{A.25}$$

We will show

1. the conditional distribution of $\hat{\xi}_{T,S,i,j}^{(b)}(\theta_{0,q}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T)$ converges in probability to that of $\hat{\xi}_{T,S,i,j}(\theta_{0,q}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T) = \sqrt{T}\hat{\Psi}_{T,S,i,j}(\theta_{0,q}, \hat{\lambda}_T, \hat{\nu}_T)$;
2. $\hat{\xi}_{T,S,i,j}^{(b)}(\hat{\theta}_{T,S,q}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T) - \hat{\xi}_{T,S,i,j}^{(b)}(\theta_{0,q}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T) = o_p(1)$.

Step (1): Mimicking the derivation of (3.15), note that the k -th element of $\hat{\xi}_{T,S,i,j}^{(b)}(\theta_{0,q}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}, \hat{\nu}_T)$ can be written as:

$$\int_{[0,1]^2} (\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}^{(b)} - \hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j})(u_i, u_j; \theta_{0,q}, \lambda_{0,i}, \lambda_{0,j}, \nu_0) \mathrm{d}\varphi_k(u_i, u_j) + o_p(1),$$

where $\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{i,j,T,S}^{(b)}(u_i, u_j; \theta_{0,q}, \lambda_{0,i}, \lambda_{0,j}, \nu_0)$ is the bootstrap analogue of $\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_{0,q}, \lambda_{0,i}, \lambda_{0,j}, \nu_0)$ defined in equation (3.14). We are thus left with showing that the conditional distribution of $\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}^{(b)}(u_i, u_j; \theta_{0,q}, \lambda_{0,i}, \lambda_{0,j}, \nu_0) - \hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_{0,q}, \lambda_{0,i}, \lambda_{0,j}, \nu_0)$ converges weakly in probability to the same limiting process that governs the weak limit of $\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_0, \lambda_{0,i}, \lambda_{0,j}, \nu_0)$. But, by the functional delta method, this is due the weak convergence of $\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_{0,q}, \lambda_{0,i}, \lambda_{0,j}, \nu_0)$; see the proof of proposition 1 in conjunction with Fermanian *et al.* (2004, theorem 5). Step (2): We can deduce the bootstrap stochastic equicontinuity of (A.24) from that of (A.25) established in 1 (c); see also Giné and Zinn (1990), Brown and Wegkamp (2002), or Chen *et al.* (2003) for a similar argument. The claim then follows from $\sqrt{T}\|\hat{\theta}_{T,S} - \theta_0\| = O_p(1)$.

B Auxiliary results

This section contains auxiliary results. We make frequently use of the following stochastic equicontinuity result due to Andrews and Pollard (1994, theorem 2.2):

Theorem B.1 For any T , let $\{\xi_{t,T} : t = 1, \dots, T; T \in \mathbb{N}_1\}$ be a strong mixing triangular array whose mixing coefficients satisfy

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i^{p-2} \alpha(i)^{\theta/(p+\theta)} < \infty \tag{i}$$

for $p \geq 2$, $p \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\theta > 0$, and let \mathcal{F} be a uniformly bounded class of real-valued functions whose bracketing

$$\int_0^1 x^{-\theta/(2+\theta)} \mathcal{N}_{[\cdot]}(x, \mathcal{F}, \rho(\cdot))^{1/p} \mathrm{d}x < \infty, \tag{ii}$$

for the same p and θ , while $\rho(f) := \sup_{t,T} \|f(\xi_{t,T})\|_2$. Then for each $\epsilon_0 > 0$ there is a $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that

$$\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sup_{\rho(f-g) < \epsilon_1} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T [f(\xi_{t,T}) - g(\xi_{t,T})] \right| \right\|_p < \epsilon_0. \quad (**)$$

Remark B.1 Note that $\int_0^1 1/x^c dx < \infty$ for $c < 1$. Thus, if $\alpha(i) = O(i^{-a})$ and $\mathcal{N}_{[]}(\mathcal{F}, \rho(\cdot)) = O(i^{-b})$ for $a, b > 0$, then (i) and (ii) are satisfied if $p > b(2 + \theta)/2$ and $a > (p - 1)(p + \theta)/\theta$ so that $p \geq 2$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

Recall that the bracketing number $\mathcal{N}_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \rho)$ denotes the minimum number of ε -brackets needed to cover a class \mathcal{F} of functions $f : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{E}$ equipped with a metric ρ :

$$\mathcal{N}_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \rho) := \min\{m : \exists (\{l_j, u_j\})_{j=1}^m \text{ s.th. } \rho(u_j, l_j) \leq \varepsilon, \mathcal{F} \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^m [l_j, u_j]\}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where the bracket $[l_j, u_j]$ is defined by

$$[l_j, u_j] := \{f \in \mathcal{F} : l_j(x) \leq h(x) \leq u_j(x), \forall x \in \mathcal{X}\},$$

see, e.g. van der Vaart and Wellner (1996).

Lemma B.1 For any $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ with $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$, $q = 1, \dots, Q$,

- (a) $\{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) : u_i, u_j \in [0, 1], \lambda_k \in \Lambda_{T,k}, k \in \{i, j\}\}$ is stochastically equicontinuous;
- (b) Let $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) := \sqrt{T}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) - \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_{0,i}, \lambda_{0,j}))$. Then,

$$\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_T(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) = \bar{\mathbb{V}}_T(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) + o_p(1),$$

uniformly in $u_k \in [0, 1], \lambda_k \in \Lambda_{T,k}$, with

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\mathbb{V}}_T(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \{i, j\}} \partial_k \mathcal{C}_q(u_i, u_j) \mathbf{f}_k \{F_k^{-1}(u_k)\} \mathbf{E}[\tau_k(R_1, u_k, \lambda_{0,k})] \sqrt{T}(\lambda_k - \lambda_{0,k}) + o_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau_k(R_1; u_k, \lambda_k) := \{F_k^{-1}(u_k) \nabla_{\lambda} \mu_{2,k}(R_1, \lambda_k) + \nabla_{\lambda} \mu_{1,k}(R_1, \lambda_k)\} / \mu_{k,2}(R_1, \lambda_{0,k})$ for $k \in \{i, j\}$.

(c) $\{\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_{0,i}, \lambda_{0,j}) : u_i, u_j \in [0, 1]\}$ converges weakly to a tight Gaussian process in $\ell^\infty([0, 1]^2)$.

Lemma B.2 For any $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ with $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$, $q = 1, \dots, Q$,

(a) $\{\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu) : u_i, u_j \in [0, 1], \theta_q \in \Theta, \nu \in \mathcal{V}_0\}$ is stochastically equicontinuous;

(b) Let $\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu) := \sqrt{T}(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu) - \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu_0))$. Then, $\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{T,S}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu) = \bar{\mathbb{U}}_T(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu) + o_p(1)$, uniformly in $u_i, u_j \in [0, 1], \theta_q \in \Theta, \nu \in \mathcal{V}_T$, with

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\mathbb{U}}_T(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu) \\ &= \beta \mathbb{E}[\nabla_{\nu} \sigma(M_t, \nu_0)] \sqrt{T}(\nu - \nu_0) \sum_{k \in \{i, j\}} \partial_k \mathbb{C}_q(u_i, u_j; \theta_q) \mathbf{g}_q\{\mathbb{G}_q^{-1}(u_k; \theta_q); \theta_q\} + o_p(1); \end{aligned}$$

(c) $\{\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta, \nu_0) : u_i, u_j \in [0, 1], \theta_q \in \Theta\}$ converges weakly to a tight Gaussian process in $\ell^\infty([0, 1]^2 \times \Theta)$.

Lemma B.3 Set $\hat{\mathbb{V}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) := \sqrt{T}(\hat{\mathbb{C}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) - \hat{\mathbb{C}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_{0,i}, \lambda_{0,j}))$, and define $\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu) := \sqrt{T}(\hat{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu) - \hat{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu_0))$. Then,

(a) $\sup_{u_i, u_j \in [0, 1]} |\hat{\mathbb{V}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j})| = o_p(1)$, (b) $\sup_{\theta_q \in \Theta} \sup_{u_i, u_j \in [0, 1]} |\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{i,j,T,S}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T)| = o_p(1)$.

Lemma B.4 For any $k \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ and $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$, $q = 1, \dots, Q$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{T}(\hat{\psi}_{T,i,j,k}(\hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) - \psi_{q,k}) \\ &= \int_{[0, 1]^2} \sqrt{T}(\hat{\mathbb{C}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) - \mathbb{C}_q(u_i, u_j)) \mathbf{d}\varphi_k(u_i, u_j) + o_p(1). \end{aligned} \tag{a}$$

and, uniformly in $\theta_q \in \Theta$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{T}(\hat{\psi}_{T,S,i,j,k}(\theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T) - \psi_{q,k}(\theta_q)) \\ &= \int_{[0, 1]^2} \sqrt{T}(\hat{\mathbb{C}}_{T,S,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \hat{\nu}_T) - \mathbb{C}_q(u_i, u_j; \theta_q)) \mathbf{d}\varphi_k(u_i, u_j) + o_p(1). \end{aligned} \tag{b}$$

B.1 Proof of lemma B.1

Proof of lemma B.1-(a): Let $a_{1,k}(R_t, \lambda_k) := \{\mu_{1,k}(R_t, \lambda_k) - \mu_{1,k}(R_t, \lambda_{0,k})\}/\mu_{2,k}(R_t, \lambda_{0,k})$ and $a_{2,k}(R_t, \lambda_k) := \mu_{2,k}(R_t, \lambda_k)/\mu_{2,k}(R_t, \lambda_{0,k})$, $k \in \{i, j\}$. To begin with, consider

$$\begin{aligned} & 1\{\hat{\eta}_{i,t}(\lambda_i) \leq F_i^{-1}(u_i), \hat{\eta}_{j,t}(\lambda_j) \leq F_j^{-1}(u_j)\} \\ &= 1\{\eta_{i,t} \leq F_i^{-1}(u_i)a_{2,i}(R_t, \lambda_i) + a_{1,i}(R_t, \lambda_i), \eta_{j,t} \leq F_j^{-1}(u_j)a_{2,j}(R_t, \lambda_j) + a_{1,j}(R_t, \lambda_j)\} \\ &=: f(\eta_{i,t}, \eta_{j,t}, R_t), \end{aligned}$$

where f can be viewed as an element of the function class

$$\mathcal{F} := \left\{ \eta_{i,t}, \eta_{j,t}, R_t \mapsto 1\{\eta_{i,t} \leq F_i^{-1}(u_i)a_{2,i}(R_t, \lambda_i) + a_{1,i}(R_t, \lambda_i), \eta_{j,t} \leq F_j^{-1}(u_j)a_{2,j}(R_t, \lambda_j) + a_{1,j}(R_t, \lambda_j)\} : \right. \\ \left. u_i, u_j \in [0, 1], \lambda_k \in \Lambda_{T,k}, k \in \{i, j\} \right\}.$$

Therefore, $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j)$ can be viewed as an empirical process indexed by \mathcal{F} ; i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{T,i,j} : \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ & f \in \mathcal{F}, f \longmapsto \mathbb{V}_{T,i,j}(f) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \{f(\eta_{i,t}, \eta_{j,t}, R_t) - \mathbb{E}[f(\eta_{i,t}, \eta_{j,t}, R_t)]\}. \end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

To make use of theorem B.1, $\mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_2)$ needs to be determined. Since $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{H}_i \cdot \mathcal{H}_j$ and $\mathcal{N}_{[\cdot]}(2\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_2) \leq \mathcal{N}_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{H}_i, \|\cdot\|_2)\mathcal{N}_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{H}_j, \|\cdot\|_2)$ [see, e.g., see, e.g., Kosorok (2008, lemma 9.25 (ii))], it remains to compute $\mathcal{N}_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{H}_k, \|\cdot\|_2)$, where

$$\mathcal{H}_k := \left\{ \eta_{k,t}, R_t \mapsto 1\{\eta_{k,t} \leq ya_{2,k}(R_t, \lambda_k) + a_{1,k}(R_t, \lambda_k)\} : y \in \mathbb{R}, \lambda_k \in \Lambda_{T,k} \right\}, \quad k \in \{i, j\}.$$

An element $h \in \mathcal{H}_k$ can be uniquely identified by $\{y, \lambda_k\}$; thus, we use the notation $h(\eta_{k,t}, R_t) = h(\eta_{k,t}, R_t; y, \lambda_k)$ to refer to a specific member of \mathcal{H}_k .

Begin by determining $\mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{H}_k, \|\cdot\|_2)$. In doing so, we mimic the proof of lemma 1 in Akritas and Van Keilegom (2001). For brevity, let us drop the index $k \in \{i, j\}$. Since $\Lambda_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^r$ is compact, we can fix a grid $\{\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(N)}\}$, with $N = O(\epsilon^{-2r})$, to cover Λ_T with N balls $\{\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_N\}$, each of radius ϵ^2 ; i.e., for each λ , there exists at least one integer $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ such that $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_i := \{\tilde{\lambda} \in \Lambda_T : \|\lambda - \lambda^{(i)}\| \leq \epsilon^2\}$. Now, for such an integer i , assumption E ensures

$a_j(R_t, \lambda) \leq a_j(R_t, \lambda^{(i)}) + \epsilon^2 \dot{\mu}(R_t)$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Therefore, $\{a_j(R_t, \lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda_T\}$ can be covered by $[l_{j,i}(R_t), u_{j,i}(R_t)]$ for $j \in \{1, 2\}$, where $u_{j,i}(R_t) := a_j(R_t, \lambda^{(i)}) + \epsilon^2 \dot{\mu}(R_t)$, $l_{j,i}(R_t) := a_j(R_t, \lambda^{(i)}) - \epsilon^2 \dot{\mu}(R_t)$. Hence, by monotonicity of the indicator function, we can cover each $h \in \mathcal{H}$ for a fix $y \in \mathbb{R}$ by

$$1\{\eta_t \leq y l_{2,j}(R_t) + l_{1,i}(R_t)\} \leq h(\eta_t, R_t; y, \lambda) \leq 1\{\eta_t \leq y u_{2,j}(R_t) + u_{1,i}(R_t)\}, \quad i, j \in \{1, \dots, N\}.$$

Next, we can partition the real line by a total of $N_1 = O(\epsilon^{-2})$ points for given $\{i, j\}$: $-\infty = \bar{y}_{i,j,1} \leq \bar{y}_{i,j,2} \leq \dots \leq \bar{y}_{i,j,N_1} = \infty$ such that for $2 \leq k \leq N_1$

$$F(\bar{y}_{i,j,k} u_{2,j}(R_t) + u_{1,i}(R_t)) - F(\bar{y}_{i,j,k-1} u_{2,j}(R_t) + u_{1,i}(R_t)) \leq K \epsilon^2.$$

Similarly, for some $N_2 = O(\epsilon^{-2})$ there exists a partition $-\infty = \underline{y}_{i,j,1} \leq \underline{y}_{i,j,2} \leq \dots \leq \underline{y}_{i,j,N_2} = \infty$ such that for $2 \leq k \leq N_2$

$$F(\underline{y}_{i,j,k} l_{2,j}(R_t) + l_{1,i}(R_t)) - F(\underline{y}_{i,j,k-1} l_{2,j}(R_t) + l_{1,i}(R_t)) \leq K \epsilon^2.$$

Now, define the following brackets for y by $\underline{y}_{i,j}^\dagger \leq y \leq \bar{y}_{i,j}^\dagger$, with

$$\underline{y}_{i,j}^\dagger := \max_{1 \leq k \leq N_1} \{y_{i,j,k} : y_{i,j,k} \leq y\}, \quad \bar{y}_{i,j}^\dagger := \min_{1 \leq k \leq N_2} \{\bar{y}_{i,j,k} : \bar{y}_{i,j,k} \geq y\}.$$

Thus, with $L_{i,j}(\eta_t, R_t) := 1\{\eta_t \leq \underline{y}_{i,j}^\dagger l_{2,j}(R_t) + l_{1,i}(R_t)\}$, $U_{i,j}(\eta_t, R_t) := 1\{\eta_t \leq \bar{y}_{i,j}^\dagger u_{2,j}(R_t) + u_{1,i}(R_t)\}$, we obtain a total of $N := O(\epsilon^{-4(r+1)})$ brackets $[L_{i,j}(\eta_t, R_t), U_{i,j}(\eta_t, R_t)]$ covering \mathcal{H} and whose $\|\cdot\|_2$ length is $O(\epsilon)$. To see this, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_{i,j}(\eta_t, R_t) - L_{i,j}(\eta_t, R_t)\|_2^2 &= \mathbb{E}[F(\bar{y}_{i,j}^\dagger u_{2,j}(R_t) + u_{1,i}(R_t))] - \mathbb{E}[F(\underline{y}_{i,j}^\dagger l_{2,j}(R_t) + l_{1,i}(R_t))] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[F(y u_{2,j}(R_t) + u_{1,i}(R_t))] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[F(y l_{2,j}(R_t) + l_{1,i}(R_t))] + K \epsilon^2. \end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

Next, set $b_{q,i}(R_t; z) := a_q(R_t, \lambda^{(i)}) + z \dot{\mu}(R_t)$ and note that $l_{q,i}(R_t) = b_{q,i}(R_t; -\epsilon^2)$ and $u_{q,i}(R_t) =$

$b_{q,i}(R_t; \epsilon^2)$ for $q \in \{1, 2\}$. By the mean-value theorem, there exists $x \in (-\epsilon^2, \epsilon^2)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{F}(y u_{2,j}(R_t) + u_{1,i}(R_t))] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{F}(y l_{2,j}(R_t) + l_{1,i}(R_t))] \\
&= 2\epsilon^2 \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{f}\{y b_{2,i}(R_t; x) + b_{1,j}(R_t; x)\}(1+y)\dot{\mu}(R_t)] \\
&= 2\epsilon^2 \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{f}\{y b_{2,i}(R_t; x) + b_{1,j}(R_t; x)\}[y b_{2,i}(R_t; x) + b_{1,j}(R_t; x)]\dot{\mu}(R_t)/b_{2,i}(R_t; x)] \\
&\quad - 2\epsilon^2 \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{f}\{y b_{2,i}(R_t; x) + b_{1,j}(R_t; x)\}\dot{\mu}(R_t)b_{1,i}(R_t; x)/b_{2,i}(R_t; x)] \\
&\quad + 2\epsilon^2 \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{f}\{y b_{2,i}(R_t; x) + b_{1,j}(R_t; x)\}\dot{\mu}(R_t)] \\
&\leq 2\epsilon^2 (\underline{b}\mathbb{E}[\dot{\mu}(R_1)] \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{f}(y)y| + \underline{b}\mathbb{E}[\dot{\mu}(R_1)^2](\epsilon^2 + K_\lambda/\sqrt{T}) \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{f}(y) + \mathbb{E}[\dot{\mu}(R_1)] \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{f}(y)),
\end{aligned} \tag{B.4}$$

where the last equality uses that, by assumption E, there exists a $\underline{b} \in (0, \infty)$ such that $b_{2,i}(R_t; x) > 1/\underline{b}$ and $|b_{1,i}(R_t; x)| \leq \dot{\mu}(R_t)(|x| + \|\lambda^{(i)} - \lambda_0\|)$. Therefore, $\mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_2) = O(\epsilon^{-8(1+r)})$ and the claim follows by theorem B.1.

Proof of lemma B.1-(b): First, it is shown that $\bar{\mathbb{V}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j)] + o(1)$ uniformly in $u_k \in [0, 1]$, $\lambda_k \in \Lambda_{T,k}$, $k \in \{i, j\}$. Set $y_k(R_1; u_k, \lambda_k) := \mathbb{F}_k^{-1}(u_k)a_{2,k}(R_1, \lambda_k) + a_{1,k}(R_1, \lambda_k)$ and define the map $\lambda \mapsto T(u_i, u_j, \lambda_i, \lambda_j) := \mathbb{F}_{i,j}\{y_i(R_1; u_i, \lambda_i), y_j(R_1; u_j, \lambda_j)\}$. For brevity, suppose that $r = 1$; i.e., λ_i and λ_j are scalar-valued. Using Resnick (1999, property 12 (b)), a second-order Taylor-series expansion with Lagrange remainder around $\lambda_{0,i}$ and $\lambda_{0,j}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{T}\mathbb{E}[T(u_i, u_j, \lambda_i, \lambda_j) - C_{i,j}(u_i, u_j)] &= \sum_{k \in \{i,j\}} \partial_k \mathbb{F}_{i,j}\{\mathbb{F}_i^{-1}(u_i), \mathbb{F}_j^{-1}(u_j)\} \mathbb{E}[\tau_k(R_1; u_k, \lambda_{0,k})] \sqrt{T}(\lambda_k - \lambda_{0,k}) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}4} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{R}_T(u_i, u_j, \tilde{\lambda}_i, \tilde{\lambda}_j)],
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}_k$ lines on the line segment connecting λ_k and $\lambda_{0,k}$; $\tau_k(R_1; u_k, \lambda) = \partial y_k(R_1; u_k, \lambda)/(\partial \lambda)$ has been defined above. Since

$$\partial_i \mathbb{F}_{i,j}(x_i, x_j) = \mathbb{P}(\eta_j \leq x_j \mid \eta_i = x_i) \mathbb{f}_i(x_i) = \partial_i C_{i,j}\{\mathbb{F}_i(x_i), \mathbb{F}_j(x_j)\} \mathbb{f}_i(x_i),$$

the claim follows if the expectation of the second-order R_T term is $o_p(1)$, uniformly in $u_i, u_j \in [0, 1]$.

To see this, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& R_T(u_i, u_j, \tilde{\lambda}_i, \tilde{\lambda}_j) \\
&= \sum_{l, k \in \{i, j\}} \partial_l \partial_k F_{i, j} \{y_i(R_1; u_i, \tilde{\lambda}_i), y_j(R_1; u_j, \tilde{\lambda}_j)\} \\
&\quad \times \tau_l(R_1; u_l, \tilde{\lambda}_l) \tau_k(R_1; u_k, \tilde{\lambda}_k) [\sqrt{T}(\lambda_l - \lambda_{0, l})] [\sqrt{T}(\lambda_k - \lambda_{0, k})] \\
&+ \sum_{k \in \{i, j\}} \partial_k F_{i, j} \{y_i(R_1; u_i, \tilde{\lambda}), y_j(R_1; u_j, \tilde{\lambda})\} \partial_k \tau_k(R_1; u_k, \tilde{\lambda}_k) [\sqrt{T}(\lambda_k - \lambda_{0, k})]^2 \\
&=: \sum_{l, k \in \{i, j\}} A_{k, l} [\sqrt{T}(\lambda_l - \lambda_{0, l})] [\sqrt{T}(\lambda_k - \lambda_{0, k})] + \sum_{k \in \{i, j\}} B_k [\sqrt{T}(\lambda_k - \lambda_{0, k})]^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{B.5}$$

say. Expanding terms, one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
& A_{k, l} = \partial_l \partial_k F_{i, j} \{y_i(R_1; u_i, \lambda_i), y_j(R_1; u_j, \lambda_j)\} \\
&\quad \times \left[y_k(R_1; u_k, \lambda_k) y_l(R_1; u_l, \lambda_l) \bar{a}_{2, k}^{(1)}(R_1, \lambda_k) \bar{a}_{2, l}^{(1)}(R_1, \lambda_l) \right. \\
&\quad + y_k(R_1; u_k, \lambda_k) \bar{a}_{2, k}^{(1)}(R_1, \lambda_k) \left(a_{1, l}^{(1)}(R_1, \lambda) - a_{1, l}(R_1, \lambda_l) \bar{a}_{2, l}^{(1)}(R_1, \lambda_l) \right) \\
&\quad + y_l(R_1; u_l, \lambda_l) \bar{a}_{2, l}^{(1)}(R_1, \lambda_l) \left(a_{1, k}^{(1)}(R_1, \lambda_k) - a_{1, k}(R_1, \lambda_k) \bar{a}_{2, k}^{(1)}(R_1, \lambda_k) \right) \\
&\quad + \bar{a}_{2, k}^{(1)}(R_1, \lambda_k) a_{1, k}(R_1, \lambda_k) \left(\bar{a}_{2, l}^{(1)}(R_1, \lambda_l) a_{1, l}(R_1, \lambda_l) - a_{1, l}^{(1)}(R_1, \lambda_l) \right) \\
&\quad \left. + a_{1, k}^{(1)}(R_1, \lambda_k) \left(a_{1, l}^{(1)}(R_1, \lambda_l) - a_{1, l}(R_1, \lambda_l) \bar{a}_{2, l}^{(1)}(R_1, \lambda_l) \right) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{B.6}$$

with $\bar{a}_{q, k}^{(1)}(R_1, \lambda_k) := a_{q, k}^{(1)}(R_1, \lambda_k) / a_{q, k}(R_1, \lambda_k)$, where $a_{q, k}^{(1)}(R_1, \lambda_k) := \partial a_{q, k}(R_1, \lambda_k) / (\partial \lambda_k)$ for $q \in \{1, 2\}$, $k \in \{i, j\}$ and it has been used that $\tau_k(R_1; u_k, \lambda_k) = D_k^{-1}(u_k) a_{2, k}^{(1)}(R_1, \lambda_k) + a_{1, k}^{(1)}(R_1, \lambda_k)$.

Therefore, the triangle inequality, assumption E, and the fact that $\|\tilde{\lambda}_k - \lambda_{0, k}\| \leq K_\lambda / \sqrt{T}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[|A_{k, l}|] &\leq \max_{k, l \in \{i, j\}} \sup_{x_i, x_j \in \mathbb{R}} |\partial_l \partial_k F_{i, j}(x_i, x_j) x_k x_l| \underline{b}^2 E[\dot{\mu}(R_1)^2] \\
&+ \max_{k, l \in \{i, j\}} \sup_{x_i, x_j \in \mathbb{R}} |\partial_l \partial_k F_{i, j}(x_i, x_j) x_k| \underline{b} \{E[\dot{\mu}(R_1)^2] + \underline{b} E[|\dot{\mu}(R_1)|^3] K_\lambda / \sqrt{T}\} \\
&+ \max_{k, l \in \{i, j\}} \sup_{x_i, x_j \in \mathbb{R}} |\partial_l \partial_k F_{i, j}(x_i, x_j) x_l| \underline{b} \{E[\dot{\mu}(R_1)^2] + \underline{b} E[|\dot{\mu}(R_1)|^3] K_\lambda / \sqrt{T}\} \\
&+ \underline{b}^2 E[\dot{\mu}(R_1)^4] K_\lambda^2 / T + 2 \underline{b} E[|\dot{\mu}(R_1)|^3] K_\lambda / \sqrt{T} + E[\dot{\mu}(R_1)^2] < \infty.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.7}$$

Similarly, it can be shown that $E[|B_k|] < \infty$. Therefore, $E[\tilde{V}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j)] = \sqrt{T}E[T(u_i, u_j, \lambda_i, \lambda_j) - C_{i,j}(u_i, u_j)] = \bar{V}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) + O(1/\sqrt{T})$.

Next, in view of equation (B.2), one gets $\tilde{V}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) = \tilde{C}_{T,i,j}(f - f_0) + \bar{V}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j)$, where $f, f_0 \in \mathcal{F}$, with f_0 restricted to $\lambda_k = \lambda_{k,0}$, $k \in \{i, j\}$. By part (a) of this lemma, $\tilde{C}_{T,i,j}$ is stochastically equicontinuous. Thus, it remains to be shown that $\|f - f_0\|_2 \rightarrow 0$. To see this, consider

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|f(\eta_{i,t}, \eta_{j,t}, R_t) - f_0(\eta_{i,t}, \eta_{i,t}, R_t)\|_2^2 \\
& \leq \sum_{k \in \{i, j\}} \|1\{\eta_{k,t} \leq F_k^{-1}(u_k)a_{2,k}(R_t, \lambda_k) + a_{1,k}(R_t, \lambda_k)\} - 1\{\eta_{k,t} \leq F_k^{-1}(u_k)\}\|_2^2 \\
& = \sum_{k \in \{i, j\}} \{E[F_k(F_k^{-1}(u_k)a_{2,k}(R_t, \lambda_k) + a_{1,k}(R_t, \lambda_k))] + u_k \\
& \quad - 2E[F_k(\min\{u_k, F_k^{-1}(u_k)a_{2,k}(R_t, \lambda_k) + a_{1,k}(R_t, \lambda_k)\})]\} \\
& \leq \sum_{k \in \{i, j\}} |E[f_k\{F_k^{-1}(u_k)a_{2,k}(R_t, \tilde{\lambda}_k) + a_{1,k}(R_t, \tilde{\lambda}_k)\}\tau_k(R_t, u_k, \tilde{\lambda}_k)](\lambda_k - \lambda_{0,k})|
\end{aligned} \tag{B.8}$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}_k$ lies between $\lambda_{0,k}$ and λ_k . By similar arguments as just used to prove (B.7), one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
& f_k\{F_k^{-1}(u_k)a_{2,k}(R_1, \tilde{\lambda}_k) + a_{1,k}(R_1, \tilde{\lambda}_k)\}\tau_k(R_1, u_k, \tilde{\lambda}_k) \\
& = f_k\{F_k^{-1}(u_k)a_{2,k}(R_1, \tilde{\lambda}_k) + a_{1,k}(R_1, \tilde{\lambda}_k)\}\{F_k^{-1}(u_k)a_{2,k}(R_1, \tilde{\lambda}_k) + a_{1,k}(R_1, \tilde{\lambda}_k)\}\bar{a}_{2,k}^{(1)}(R_1, \tilde{\lambda}_k) \\
& \quad - f_k\{F_k^{-1}(u_k)a_{2,k}(R_1, \tilde{\lambda}_k) + a_{1,k}(R_1, \tilde{\lambda}_k)\}\bar{a}_{2,k}^{(1)}(R_1, \tilde{\lambda}_k)a_{1,k}(R_1, \tilde{\lambda}_k) \\
& \quad + f_k\{F_k^{-1}(u_k)a_{2,k}(R_1, \tilde{\lambda}_k) + a_{1,k}(R_1, \tilde{\lambda}_k)\}\bar{a}_{2,k}^{(1)}(R_1, \tilde{\lambda}_k) \\
& \leq \dot{\mu}(R_1)\{\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} |f(y)y|\bar{b} + \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} f(y)\dot{\mu}(R_1)K_\lambda/\sqrt{T}\bar{b} + \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} f(y)K_\lambda/\sqrt{T}\},
\end{aligned}$$

which, in turn, implies $\|f(\eta_{i,t}, \eta_{j,t}, R_t) - f_0(\eta_{i,t}, \eta_{i,t}, R_t)\|_2^2 = O(1/\sqrt{T})$. This completes the proof.

Proof of lemma B.1-(c): Note that $E[\tilde{C}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_{0,i}, \lambda_{0,j})] = C_{i,j}(u_i, u_j)$. The claim thus follows from part (a) of this lemma and the ‘fidi’-convergence of $\tilde{C}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_{0,i}, \lambda_{0,j})$ which is readily obtained by the CLT for *i.i.d.* data.

B.2 Proof of lemma B.2

Proof of lemma B.2-(a): Throughout, suppose that $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$ for some $q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$. Recall, that $\varepsilon_{k,t,s}(\delta) = \mathbf{D}_\varepsilon^{-1}(\varepsilon_{k,t,s}^*; \delta)$, $k \in \{i, j\}$, and $F_{t,s}(\gamma) = \mathbf{D}_F^{-1}(F_{t,s}^*; \gamma)$, with $\mathbf{D}_F^{-1}(F_{t,s}^*; \gamma) := (\mathbf{D}_{F,1}^{-1}(F_{t,s,1}^*; \gamma_1), \dots, \mathbf{D}_{F,p_\alpha}^{-1}(F_{t,s,p_\alpha}^*; \gamma_{p_\alpha}))'$; $\varepsilon_{k,t,s}^*$ and $F_{t,s}^* := (F_{t,s,1}^*, \dots, F_{t,s,p_\alpha}^*)'$ denote mutually independent *i.i.d.* draws from the standard uniform distribution. Moreover, observe that

$$\hat{X}_{k,t,s}(\theta_q, \nu) = X_{k,t,s}(\theta_q) - \beta'_q \Delta(M_t, \nu), \quad \Delta(M_t, \nu) := \sigma(M_t, \nu) - \sigma(M_t, \nu_0),$$

where $\sigma(M_t, \nu) := (\sigma_1(M_t, \nu_1), \dots, \sigma_{p_\beta}(M_t, \nu_{p_\beta}))' \in \mathbb{R}^{p_\beta}$, with $\nu := (\nu'_1, \dots, \nu'_{p_\beta})' \in \mathbb{R}^{mp_\beta}$. Using that $G_i = G_j = \mathbf{G}_q$ for any $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 1\{\hat{X}_{i,t,s}(\theta_q, \nu) \leq \mathbf{G}_q^{-1}(u_i; \theta_q), \hat{X}_{j,t,s}(\theta_q, \nu) \leq \mathbf{G}_q^{-1}(u_j; \theta_q)\} \\ &= 1\{X_{i,t,s}(\theta_q) \leq \mathbf{G}_q^{-1}(u_i; \theta_q) + \beta'_q \Delta(M_t, \nu), X_{j,t,s}(\theta) \leq \mathbf{G}_q^{-1}(u_j; \theta) + \beta'_q \Delta(M_t, \nu)\} \\ &= 1\{\varepsilon_{i,t,s}^* \leq \mathbf{D}_\varepsilon[\mathbf{G}_q^{-1}(u_i; \theta_q) - \alpha'_q \mathbf{D}_F^{-1}(F_{t,s}^*; \gamma) + \beta'_q (\Delta(M_t, \nu) - Z_t); \delta], \\ &\quad \varepsilon_{j,t,s}^* \leq \mathbf{D}_\varepsilon[\mathbf{G}_q^{-1}(u_j; \theta_q) - \alpha'_q \mathbf{D}_F^{-1}(F_{t,s}^*; \gamma) + \beta'_q (\Delta(M_t, \nu) - Z_t); \delta]\} \\ &=: f(\varepsilon_{i,t,s}^*, \varepsilon_{j,t,s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t,s}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{X}_{t,s} := (F_{t,s}^*, Z'_t, M'_t)'$ and f can be viewed as an element of the function class

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} := \left\{ \varepsilon_{i,t,s}^*, \varepsilon_{j,t,s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t,s} \mapsto 1\left\{ \varepsilon_{i,t,s}^* \leq \mathbf{D}_\varepsilon[\mathbf{G}_q^{-1}(u_i; \theta_q) - \alpha'_q \mathbf{D}_F^{-1}(F_{t,s}^*; \gamma) + \beta'_q (\Delta(M_t, \nu) - Z_t); \delta], \right. \right. \\ \left. \varepsilon_{j,t,s}^* \leq \mathbf{D}_\varepsilon[\mathbf{G}_q^{-1}(u_j; \theta_q) - \alpha'_q \mathbf{D}_F^{-1}(F_{t,s}^*; \gamma) + \beta'_q (\Delta(M_t, \nu) - Z_t); \delta] \right\} : \\ \left. u_i, u_j \in [0, 1], \theta_q \in \Theta, \nu \in \mathcal{V}_0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Formally, an element $f \in \mathcal{F}$ can be uniquely identified by the quadruple $\{u_i, u_j, \theta_q, \nu\}$. Hence, in order to refer to a specific $f \in \mathcal{F}$, the notation $f(\varepsilon_{i,t,s}^*, \varepsilon_{j,t,s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t,s}) = f(\varepsilon_{i,t,s}^*, \varepsilon_{j,t,s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t,s}; u_i, u_j, \theta_q, \nu)$ is used. Moreover, define

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}} := \left\{ \xi_{i,j,t,S} \mapsto \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S f(\varepsilon_{i,t,s}^*, \varepsilon_{j,t,s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t,s}), f \in \mathcal{F} \right\}, \quad (\text{B.9})$$

where

$$\xi_{i,j,t,S} := (\varepsilon_{i,t,1}^*, \varepsilon_{j,t,1}^*, F_{t,1}^*, \dots, \varepsilon_{i,t,S}^*, \varepsilon_{j,t,S}^*, F_{t,S}^*, M'_t)'$$

Therefore, $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j,T,S}(u_i, u_j, \theta_q, \lambda)$, defined in equation (A.6), can be viewed as an empirical process indexed by $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$; i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j,T,S} : \bar{\mathcal{F}} &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \bar{f} \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{f} &\longmapsto \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j,T,S}(\bar{f}) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \{\bar{f}(\xi_{i,j,t,S}) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{f}(\xi_{i,j,t,S})]\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.10})$$

Again, a specific element $\bar{f} \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}$ will be identified by the quadruple $\{u_i, u_j, \theta_q, \nu\}$ for which we write $\bar{f}(\xi_{i,j,t,S}) = \bar{f}(\xi_{i,j,t,S}; u_i, u_j, \theta_q, \nu)$.

We show that $\mathcal{N}_{[]}(\epsilon, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \rho) = O(\epsilon^{-4(m+p+2)})$, which yields, in view of theorem B.1, the result. To verify the preceding display, suppose we can cover \mathcal{F} with brackets $L_k(\varepsilon_{i,t,s}^*, \varepsilon_{j,t,s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t,s}) \leq f(\varepsilon_{i,t,s}^*, \varepsilon_{j,t,s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t,s}) \leq U_k(\varepsilon_{i,t,s}^*, \varepsilon_{j,t,s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t,s})$, $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $k = 1, \dots, N := \mathcal{N}_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_2)$. We can now construct $\mathcal{N}_{[]}(\epsilon, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \rho)$ brackets for $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ by setting

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{L}_k(\xi_{i,j,t,S}) &:= \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S L_k(\varepsilon_{i,t,s}^*, \varepsilon_{j,t,s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t,s}), \\ \bar{U}_k(\xi_{i,j,t,S}) &:= \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S U_k(\varepsilon_{i,t,s}^*, \varepsilon_{j,t,s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t,s}), \quad k = 1, \dots, N. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

Note that, by the triangle inequality and the stationarity of $\{\xi_{i,j,t,S} : t \geq 1\}$, one gets

$$\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|\bar{U}_k(\xi_{i,j,t,S}) - \bar{L}_k(\xi_{i,j,t,S})\|_2 \leq \|U_k(\varepsilon_{i,t,s}^*, \varepsilon_{j,t,s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t,s}) - L_k(\varepsilon_{i,t,s}^*, \varepsilon_{j,t,s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t,s})\|_2 \leq \epsilon.$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{N}_{[]}(\epsilon, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \rho) = \mathcal{N}_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_2)$. To proceed, note that $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_i \cdot \mathcal{H}_j$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_k &:= \left\{ \varepsilon_{k,t,s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t,s} \mapsto 1\{\varepsilon_{k,t,s}^* \leq \mathbb{D}_\varepsilon[\mathbb{G}_q^{-1}(u_k; \theta_q) - \alpha'_q \mathbb{D}_F^{-1}(F_{t,s}^*; \gamma) + \beta'_q(\Delta(M_t, \nu) - Z_t); \delta]\} : \right. \\ &\quad \left. u_k \in [0, 1], \theta_q \in \Theta, \nu \in \mathcal{V}_0 \right\}, \quad k \in \{i, j\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

Since $\mathcal{N}_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_2) \leq \mathcal{N}_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{H}_i, \|\cdot\|_2) \mathcal{N}_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{H}_j, \|\cdot\|_2)$, it remains to compute $\mathcal{N}_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{H}_k, \|\cdot\|_2)$ for $k \in \{i, j\}$; see, e.g., Kosorok (2008, lemma 9.25 (ii)). We will show that $\mathcal{N}_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{H}_k, \|\cdot\|_2) = O(\epsilon^{2(p+m+2)})$. For a given $\{\varepsilon_{k,t,s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t,s}\}$, we can formally identify a specific element $h_k \in \mathcal{H}_k$ through its arguments $\{u_k, \alpha_q, \beta_q, \gamma, \delta, \nu\}$ via $h_k(\varepsilon_{k,t,s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t,s}) = h_k(\varepsilon_{k,t,s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t,s}; u_k, \theta_q, \nu)$; with

$$h_k(\varepsilon_{k,t,s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t,s}; u_k, \theta_q, \nu) := 1\{\varepsilon_{k,t,s}^* \leq \mathbb{D}_k(\mathcal{X}_{t,s}; u_k, \theta_q, \nu)\}, \quad (\text{B.13})$$

where

$$\mathbf{D}_k(\mathcal{X}_{t,s}; u_k, \alpha_q, \beta_q, \gamma, \delta, \nu) := \mathbf{D}_\varepsilon[\mathbf{G}_q^{-1}(u_k; \theta_q) - \alpha'_q \mathbf{D}_F^{-1}(F_{t,s}^*; \gamma) + \beta'_q(\Delta(M_t, \nu) - Z_t); \delta], \quad (\text{B.14})$$

for $k \in \{i, j\}$, and we reiterate here that $\theta_q = (\alpha'_q, \beta'_q, \gamma', \delta')' \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$. Since, by assumption, Θ is compact, we can assume that $\alpha_q \in [-K_\alpha, K_\alpha]^{p_\alpha}$, $\beta_q \in [-K_\beta, K_\beta]^{p_\beta}$, $\gamma \in [-K_\gamma, K_\gamma]^{p_\alpha p_\gamma}$, and $\delta \in [-K_\delta, K_\delta]^{p_\delta}$, for finite, non-negative constants $K_\alpha, K_\beta, K_\gamma$ and K_δ . To keep the notational complexity tractable, we drop the subscript $k \in \{i, j\}$.

Similar to the proof of part (a) of lemma B.1, we begin, for a given $u \in [0, 1]$, with the construction of brackets by successively covering

$$(a) \ \mathbf{D}_\varepsilon(\cdot; \delta), \ \delta \in [-K_\delta, K_\delta]^{p_\delta},$$

$$(b) \ \alpha'_q \mathbf{D}_F^{-1}(\cdot; \gamma), \ \alpha_q \in [-K_\alpha, K_\alpha]^{p_\alpha}, \ \gamma \in [-K_\gamma, K_\gamma]^{p_\alpha p_\gamma}, \text{ and}$$

$$(c) \ \beta'_q \Delta(\cdot; \nu), \ \beta_q \in [-K_\beta, K_\beta]^{p_\beta}, \ \nu \in \mathcal{V}_0.$$

Step (a): By compactness, we can fix a grid $\{\delta^{(1)}, \dots, \delta^{(N_1)}\}$ of length $N_1 = O(\varepsilon^{-2p_\delta})$, to cover $[-K_\delta, K_\delta]^{p_\delta}$ with N_1 balls $\{\mathcal{B}_1(\delta), \dots, \mathcal{B}_{N_1}(\delta)\}$, each of radius ε^2 ; i.e., for each δ , there is at least one $i_1 \in \mathcal{J}_1 := \{1, \dots, N_1\}$ such that $\delta \in \mathcal{B}_{i_1}(\delta) := \{\delta : \|\delta - \delta^{(i_1)}\| \leq \varepsilon^2\}$. Now, for such a number $i_1 \in \mathcal{J}_1$, assumption D yields $\mathbf{D}_\varepsilon(x; \delta) \leq \mathbf{D}_\varepsilon(x; \delta^{(i_1)}) + K_1 \varepsilon^2$, $K_1 := \sup_{\delta \in \Theta} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbf{d}_\varepsilon(x; \delta)$. Thus, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\{\mathbf{D}_\varepsilon(x; \delta) : \delta \in [-K_\delta, K_\delta]^{p_\delta}\}$ can be covered by N_1 brackets

$$[\mathbf{D}_\varepsilon(x; \delta^{(i_1)}) - K_1 \varepsilon^2, \mathbf{D}_\varepsilon(x; \delta^{(i_1)}) + K_1 \varepsilon^2], \ i_1 \in \mathcal{J}_1.$$

Step (b): Analogously, fix a grid $\{\gamma^1, \dots, \gamma^{(N_2)}\}$ to cover $[-K_\gamma, K_\gamma]^{p_\alpha p_\gamma}$ with $N_2 = O(\varepsilon^{-2p_\alpha p_\gamma})$ balls $\{\mathcal{B}_1(\gamma), \dots, \mathcal{B}_{N_2}(\gamma)\}$ each of radius ε^2 . Hence, any γ is in at least one ball $\mathcal{B}_{i_2}(\gamma)$, $i_2 \in \mathcal{J}_2 := \{1, \dots, N_2\}$. For each such $i_2 \in \mathcal{J}_2$, fix a grid $\alpha_q^{(1)}, \dots, \alpha_q^{(N_3)}$ to cover the rectangle $[-K_\alpha, K_\alpha]^{p_\alpha}$ with $N_3 := \lceil \varepsilon^{-2p_\alpha} \rceil$ balls $\{\mathcal{B}_1(\alpha), \dots, \mathcal{B}_{N_3}(\alpha)\}$ each of radius ε^2 . Thus, for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{B}_{i_2}(\gamma)$, $i_2 \in \mathcal{J}_2$ and any $\alpha \in [-K_\alpha, K_\alpha]^{p_\alpha}$, we have $\|\gamma - \gamma^{(i_2)}\| \leq \varepsilon^2$ and $\|\alpha_q - \alpha_q^{(i_3)}\| \leq \varepsilon^2$ for some $\alpha_q^{(i_3)}$, $i_3 \in \mathcal{J}_3 := \{1, \dots, N_3\}$. Hence, by assumption D, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_q \mathbf{D}_F^{-1}(F_{t,s}^*; \gamma) &= \alpha_q^{(i_3)'} \mathbf{D}_F^{-1}(F_{t,s}^*; \gamma^{(i_2)}) + [\alpha'_q \mathbf{D}_F^{-1}(F_{t,s}^*; \gamma) - \alpha_q^{(i_3)'} \mathbf{D}_F^{-1}(F_{t,s}^*; \gamma^{(i_2)})] \\ &\leq \alpha_q^{(i_3)'} \mathbf{D}_F^{-1}(F_{t,s}^*; \gamma^{(i_2)}) + \varepsilon^2 \zeta_1(F_{t,s}^*), \end{aligned}$$

with $\zeta_1(F_{t,s}^*) := \dot{Q}(F_{t,s}^*)(1 + K_\alpha)$. Therefore, we can cover $\{\alpha'_q \mathsf{D}_F^{-1}(F_{t,s}^*; \gamma) : \alpha_q \in [-K_\alpha, K_\alpha]^{p_\alpha}, \gamma \in [-K_\alpha, K_\alpha]^{p_\alpha p_\gamma}\}$ with brackets of the form

$$[\alpha_q^{(i_3)'} \mathsf{D}_F^{-1}(F_{t,s}^*; \gamma^{(i_2)}) - \epsilon^2 \zeta_1(F_{t,s}^*), \alpha_q^{(i_3)'} \mathsf{D}_F^{-1}(F_{t,s}^*; \gamma^{(i_2)}) + \epsilon^2 \zeta_1(F_{t,s}^*)], \quad i_2 \in \mathcal{J}_2, i_3 \in \mathcal{J}_3. \quad (\text{B.15})$$

Step (c): Similar to the two preceding steps, consider a grid $\{\nu^{(1)}, \dots, \nu^{(N_4)}\}$ to cover $\mathcal{V}_0 := \{\nu : \sqrt{T} \|\nu - \nu_0\| \leq K_\nu\}$ with $N_4 = O(\epsilon^{-2mp_\beta})$ balls $\{\mathcal{B}_1(\nu_0), \dots, \mathcal{B}_{N_4}(\nu_0)\}$ each of radius ϵ^2/\sqrt{T} . For each $i_4 \in \mathcal{J}_4 := \{1, \dots, N_4\}$, we can fix a grid $\beta_q^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_q^{(N_5)}$ to cover the rectangle $[-K_\beta, K_\beta]^{p_\beta}$ with $N_5 := \lfloor \epsilon^{-2p_\beta} \rfloor$ balls $\{\mathcal{B}_1(\beta), \dots, \mathcal{B}_{N_5}(\beta)\}$ each of radius ϵ^2 . Then, $\{\beta'_q [\Delta(M_t, \nu) - Z_t] : \beta_q \in [-K_\beta, K_\beta]^{p_\beta}, \nu \in \mathcal{V}_0\}$ can be covered by

$$[\beta_q^{(i_5)'} [\Delta(M_t, \nu^{(i_4)}) - Z_t] - \epsilon^2 \zeta_2(M_t, Z_t), \beta_q^{(i_5)'} [\Delta(M_t, \nu^{(i_4)}) - Z_t] + \epsilon^2 \zeta_2(M_t, Z_t)], \quad i_4 \in \mathcal{J}_4, i_5 \in \mathcal{J}_5,$$

with $\zeta_2(M_t, Z_t) := \dot{\sigma}(M_t)(K_\nu + K_\beta)/\sqrt{T} - Z_t$.

Combining steps (a), (b), and (c), we cover (B.14) uniformly in $\theta_q = (\alpha'_q, \beta'_q, \delta'_q, \gamma')'$ and ν for a fix $y := \mathsf{G}_q^{-1}(u; \theta_q)$ via

$$[\mathsf{D}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(y, \mathcal{X}_{t,s}) - K_1 \epsilon^2, \bar{\mathsf{D}}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(y, \mathcal{X}_{t,s}) + K_1 \epsilon^2], \quad i_j \in \mathcal{J}_j, j = 1, \dots, 5, \quad (\text{B.16})$$

where

$$\bar{\mathsf{D}}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(y, \mathcal{X}_{t,s}) = \mathsf{D}_\epsilon(y - \alpha_q^{(i_3)'} \mathsf{D}_F^{-1}(F_{t,s}^*; \gamma^{(i_2)}) + \beta_q^{(i_5)'} [\Delta(M_t, \nu^{(i_4)}) - Z_t] + \epsilon^2 \zeta_3(\mathcal{X}_{t,s}); \delta^{(i_1)}),$$

$$\mathsf{D}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(y, \mathcal{X}_{t,s}) = \mathsf{D}_\epsilon(y - \alpha_q^{(i_3)'} \mathsf{D}_F^{-1}(F_{t,s}^*; \gamma^{(i_2)}) + \beta_q^{(i_5)'} [\Delta(M_t, \nu^{(i_4)}) - Z_t] - \epsilon^2 \zeta_3(\mathcal{X}_{t,s}); \delta^{(i_1)}),$$

with

$$\zeta_3(\mathcal{X}_{t,s}) := \zeta_1(F_{t,s}^*) + \zeta_2(M_t, Z_t).$$

Importantly, the indices $i_j \in \mathcal{J}_j, j = 1, \dots, 5$, can be chosen such that for any $\theta_q = (\alpha'_q, \beta'_q, \gamma'_q, \delta'_q)'$ and ν , the distances $\|\delta - \delta^{(i_1)}\|, \|\gamma - \gamma^{(i_2)}\|, \|\alpha_q - \alpha_q^{(i_3)}\|, \|\nu - \nu^{(i_4)}\|$ and $\|\beta_q - \beta_q^{(i_5)}\|$ are all bounded from above by ϵ^2 . Next, recall that $\mathsf{G}_q^{-1}(u; \theta_q) = \mathsf{G}_q^{-1}(u; \alpha_q, \beta_q, \gamma, \delta)$. Since the brackets (B.16) are uniform in θ_q , it suffices to fix brackets for $\mathsf{G}_q^{-1}(u; \theta_q)$ uniformly in $u \in [0, 1]$ for $\bar{\mathsf{D}}_{i_1, \dots, i_5}$ and $\mathsf{D}_{i_1, \dots, i_5}$, respectively. Specifically, and similar to the proof of lemma B.1 in Akritas and Van Keilegom (2001), we can partition the real line by a total of N_6 points for given $\{i_1, \dots, i_5\}$:

$$-\infty = \bar{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5, 1} \leq \bar{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5, 2} \leq \dots \leq \bar{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5, N_6} = \infty, \quad N_6 = O(\epsilon^{-2}),$$

such that

$$\bar{D}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\bar{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5, i_6}, \mathcal{X}_{t, s}) - \bar{D}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\bar{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5, i_6 - 1}, \mathcal{X}_{t, s}) \leq K_2 \epsilon^2, \quad i_6 \in \mathcal{J}_6 := \{1, \dots, N_6\},$$

and some $K_2 \in (0, \infty)$; see, e.g., van der Vaart (1994, example 19.6). Similarly, we can let

$$-\infty = \underline{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5, 1} \leq \underline{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5, 2} \leq \dots \leq \underline{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5, N_7} = \infty, \quad N_7 = O(\epsilon^{-2}),$$

such that

$$\underline{D}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\underline{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5, i_7}, \mathcal{X}_{t, s}) - \underline{D}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\underline{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5, i_7 - 1}, \mathcal{X}_{t, s}) \leq K_2 \epsilon^2, \quad i_7 \in \mathcal{J}_7 := \{1, \dots, N_7\},$$

and some $K_2 \in (0, \infty)$. Now, define the following brackets for $\mathbf{G}_q^{-1}(u; \theta_q) \in \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\underline{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}^\dagger \leq \mathbf{G}_q^{-1}(u; \theta_q) \leq \bar{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}^\dagger,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}^\dagger &:= \max_{i_6 \in \mathcal{J}_6} \{ \underline{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5, i_6} : \underline{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5, i_6} \leq \mathbf{G}_q^{-1}(u; \theta_q) \} \\ \bar{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}^\dagger &:= \min_{i_7 \in \mathcal{J}_7} \{ \bar{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5, i_7} : \bar{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5, i_7} \geq \mathbf{G}_q^{-1}(u; \theta_q) \}. \end{aligned} \tag{B.17}$$

Hence, by the monotonicity of the indicator function, we obtain a total of

$$N := \prod_{j=1}^7 |\mathcal{J}_j| = O\left(\epsilon^{-2(p_\alpha(1+p_\gamma)+p_\beta(1+m)+p_\delta+2)}\right)$$

brackets

$$L_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\varepsilon_{t, s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t, s}) \leq h(\varepsilon_{t, s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t, s}; u, \theta, \nu) \leq U_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\varepsilon_{t, s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t, s}), \quad i_j \in \mathcal{J}_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, 5,$$

defined via

$$\begin{aligned} L_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\varepsilon_{t, s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t, s}) &:= 1\{\varepsilon_{t, s}^* \leq \underline{D}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\underline{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}^\dagger, \mathcal{X}_{t, s}) - K_1 \epsilon^2\} \\ U_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\varepsilon_{t, s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t, s}) &:= 1\{\varepsilon_{t, s}^* \leq \bar{D}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\bar{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}^\dagger, \mathcal{X}_{t, s}) + K_1 \epsilon^2\}, \end{aligned} \tag{B.18}$$

whose $\|\cdot\|_2$ length is $O(\epsilon)$. To see this, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(U_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5} - L_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5})(\varepsilon_{t,s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t,s})\|_2^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}[U_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\varepsilon_{t,s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t,s})] - \mathbb{E}[L_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\varepsilon_{t,s}^*, \mathcal{X}_{t,s})] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\bar{\mathbb{D}}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\bar{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}^\dagger, \mathcal{X}_{t,s}) - \mathbb{D}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\underline{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}^\dagger, \mathcal{X}_{t,s})] + 2K_1\epsilon^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\bar{\mathbb{D}}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\mathbb{G}^{-1}(u; \theta_q), \mathcal{X}_{t,s}) - \mathbb{D}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\mathbb{G}^{-1}(u; \theta_q), \mathcal{X}_{t,s})] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}[\bar{\mathbb{D}}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\bar{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}^\dagger, \mathcal{X}_{t,s}) - \bar{\mathbb{D}}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\mathbb{G}^{-1}(u; \theta_q), \mathcal{X}_{t,s})] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{D}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\mathbb{G}^{-1}(u; \theta_q), \mathcal{X}_{t,s}) - \mathbb{D}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\underline{y}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}^\dagger, \mathcal{X}_{t,s})] + 2K_1\epsilon^2 \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}[\bar{\mathbb{D}}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\mathbb{G}^{-1}(u; \theta_q), \mathcal{X}_{t,s}) - \mathbb{D}_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5}(\mathbb{G}^{-1}(u; \theta_q), \mathcal{X}_{t,s})] + 2(K_1 + K_2)\epsilon^2 \\
&\leq K_3\epsilon^2, \quad \text{with } K_3 := 2\{K_1(1 + \mathbb{E}[\zeta_3(\mathcal{X}_{t,s})]) + K_2\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \rho(\cdot)) = O(\epsilon^{-4(p+m+2)})$ and the claim follows by theorem B.1 in conjunction with assumption B.

Proof of lemma B.2-(b): First, it is shown that $\bar{\mathbb{U}}_{i,j,T,S}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu) = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{i,j,T,S}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu)] + o(1)$ uniformly in $u_i, u_j \in [0, 1]$, $\nu \in \mathcal{V}_T$, and $\theta_q \in \Theta$ for any $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$, $q \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$. Set $y_k(M_1; u_k, \theta_q, \nu) := \mathbb{G}_k^{-1}(u_k; \theta_q) + \beta\Delta(M_1, \nu)$ and define the map $\nu \mapsto T(u_i, u_j, \theta_q, \nu) := \mathbb{G}_{i,j}(y_i(M_1; u_i, \theta_q, \nu), y_j(M_1; u_j, \theta_q, \nu))$. For brevity, suppose that ν is a scalar. A second-order Taylor-series expansion around $\nu = \nu_0$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{T}\mathbb{E}[T(u_i, u_j, \theta_q, \nu) - C_{i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q)] &= \beta\mathbb{E}[\nabla_\nu\sigma(M_1, \nu_0)]\sqrt{T}(\nu - \nu_0) \\
&\quad \times \sum_{k \in \{i, j\}} \partial_k \mathbb{G}_{i,j} \{ \mathbb{G}_i^{-1}(u_i; \theta_q), \mathbb{G}_j^{-1}(u_j; \theta_q); \theta_q \} \\
&\quad + [\sqrt{T}(\nu - \nu_0)]^2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{T^4}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \nu^2} T(u_i, u_j, \theta_q, \tilde{\nu}) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\nu}$ lies between ν_0 and ν . In view of the discussion below equation (B.5), one readily verifies that the second-order term is asymptotically negligible. Therefore, $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{i,j,T,S}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu)] = \sqrt{T}(\mathbb{E}[T(u_i, u_j, \theta_q, \nu)] - C_{i,j}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q)) = \bar{\mathbb{U}}_{i,j,T,S}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu) + o(1)$, where it has been used that

$$\partial_i \mathbb{G}_{i,j}(x_i, x_j; \theta_q) = \partial_i C_{i,j} \{ \mathbb{G}_i(x_i; \theta_q), \mathbb{G}_j(x_j; \theta_q); \theta \} \mathbf{g}_i(x_i; \theta_q).$$

Next, by the definition of (B.10), we have $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{i,j,T,S}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_q, \nu) = \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j,T,S}(\bar{f} - \bar{f}_0) + \bar{\mathbb{V}}_{i,j,T,S}(u_i, u_j; \theta_q, \nu)$,

where $\bar{f}, \bar{f}_0 \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}$, with \bar{f}_0 is such that the restriction $\nu = \nu_0$ is imposed. By part (a) of this lemma, $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{i,j,T,S}$ is stochastically equicontinuous. By theorem B.1, it remains to be shown that $\rho(\bar{f} - \bar{f}_0) = o(1)$. To see this, note that the triangle-inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T, T \geq 1} \|\bar{f}(\xi_{i,j,t,S}) - \bar{f}_0(\xi_{i,j,t,S})\|_2 \\ & \leq \sum_{k \in \{i,j\}} \|1\{X_{k,t,s}(\theta_q) \leq \mathbf{G}_k^{-1}(u_k; \theta_q) + \beta \Delta(M_t, \nu)\} - 1\{X_{k,t,s}(\theta_q) \leq \beta \mathbf{G}_k^{-1}(u_k; \theta_q)\}\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, set $\hat{x}_k := \mathbf{G}_k^{-1}(u_k; \theta_q) + \Delta(M_1, \nu)$ and $x_k := \mathbf{G}_k^{-1}(u_k; \theta_q)$, so that we have (by the mean-value theorem) for $k \in \{i,j\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \|1\{X_{k,t,s}(\theta_q) \leq \hat{x}_k\} - 1\{X_{k,t,s}(\theta_q) \leq x_k\}\|_2 &= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{G}_k(\hat{x}_k; \theta_q)] + \mathbf{G}_k(x_k; \theta_q) - 2\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{G}_k(\min\{x_k, \hat{x}_k\}; \theta_q)] \\ &\leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbf{g}_k(y; \theta_q) \mathbf{E}[|\Delta(M_1, \nu)|] \\ &\leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbf{g}_k(y; \theta_q) \mathbf{E}[\dot{\sigma}(M_1)] \|\nu - \nu_0\| = O(1/\sqrt{T}). \end{aligned}$$

This shows $\rho(\bar{f} - \bar{f}_0) = O(1/\sqrt{T})$ and, in view of theorem B.1, completes the proof.

Proof of lemma B.2-(c): Due to part (a) of the lemma and Andrews and Pollard (1994, corollary 2.3), we are left with establishing the ‘fidi’-convergence. Similar to step (2) of the proof of proposition 1 (b), this follows from White (2001, theorem 5.11) in conjunction with the Cramér-Wold device and assumption F.

B.3 Proof of lemma B.3

Proof of lemma B.3 (a): The functional delta method [cf. van der Vaart and Wellner (1996, theorem 3.9.4)] in conjunction with assumption C and Bücher and Volgushev (2013, theorem 2.4.)

yields for each $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_q$, $q = 1, \dots, Q$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathbb{V}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) &= \tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) \\
&\quad - \partial_i C_q(u_i, u_j) \tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{i,j,T}(u_i, 1; \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) \\
&\quad - \partial_j C_q(u_i, u_j) \tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{T,i,j}(1, u_j; \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) + o_p(1) \\
&\stackrel{(1)}{=} \bar{\mathbb{V}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) \\
&\quad - \partial_i C_q(u_i, u_j) \bar{\mathbb{V}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, 1; \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) \\
&\quad - \partial_j C_q(u_i, u_j) \bar{\mathbb{V}}_{T,i,j}(1, u_j; \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) + o_p(1) \stackrel{(2)}{=} o_p(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Explanations: (1) For T sufficiently large, one has, by part (E2) of assumption E, for any $\epsilon > 0$ and any $\delta > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{u_i, u_j \in [0,1]} |\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{i,j,T}(u_i, u_j; \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) - \bar{\mathbb{V}}_{i,j,T}(u_i, u_j; \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j})| > \epsilon \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(\{\hat{\lambda}_{k,T} \in \Lambda_{T,k}, k \in \{i, j\}\}) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{u_i, u_j \in [0,1]} |\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{i,j,T}(u_i, u_j; \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) - \bar{\mathbb{V}}_{i,j,T}(u_i, u_j; \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j})| > \epsilon, \right. \\
&\quad \left. \{\hat{\lambda}_{k,T} \in \Lambda_{T,k}, k \in \{i, j\}\} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{\delta}{2} + \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{\lambda_k \in \Lambda_{T,k}, k \in \{i, j\}} \sup_{u_i, u_j \in [0,1]} |\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{i,j,T}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j) - \bar{\mathbb{V}}_{i,j,T}(u_i, u_j; \lambda_i, \lambda_j)| > \epsilon \right].
\end{aligned}$$

By part (b) of lemma B.1, the probability on the right-hand side of the preceding display can be made smaller than $\delta/2$, which proves that $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) - \bar{\mathbb{V}}_{T,i,j}(u_i, u_j; \hat{\lambda}_{T,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{T,j}) = o_p(1)$ uniformly in $u_i, u_j \in [0, 1]$. (2) Here, we use the definition of $\bar{\mathbb{V}}_{i,j,T}$, the fact that $\partial_i C_q(u_i, 1) = \partial_j C_q(1, u_j) = 1$, and assumption B. **Proof of lemma B.3 (b):** Follows by similar arguments.

B.4 Proof of lemma B.4

The proof follows by combining lemma B.1, B.2, and B.3 with Bücher and Segers (2013, lemma 7.2) and the integration by parts formula in Fermanian *et al.* (2004, p. 854) [see also Radulović *et al.* (2017) and Berghaus *et al.* (2017)] in conjunction with assumption G.

C Additional Monte Carlo experiments

This section briefly presents additional simulation results for two equidependent factor models that are also considered in our empirical illustration:

- Design 1A is a (simulable) single-factor model based on equation (4.21) without estimable factor (i.e., $\beta_0 = 0$). The model differs from the specification considered in Oh and Patton (2013, 2017) in that we allow for $\zeta_{0,1} \neq \zeta_{0,2}$. The following parametrization is inspired by the point estimates reported in the second column of Table 5.2 below: $\alpha_0 = 1.5$, $\zeta_{0,1} = 1/5$, $\zeta_{0,2} = 1/3$ and $\xi_0 = -1/5$.
- Design 1B allows for an estimable factor but imposes the symmetry restriction $\xi_0 = 0$. We set the remaining copula parameters accordingly to $\alpha_0 = 1.25$, $\beta_0 = 4/5$, $\zeta_{0,1} = 1/5$ and $\zeta_{0,2} = 1/3$. For the simulable factor, a transformed GARCH(1,1) innovation is considered; i.e., $Z_t := \log|\tilde{Z}_t|$, where

$$\tilde{W}_t = \sigma_t \tilde{Z}_t, \quad \sigma_t^2 := \nu_{0,1} + \nu_{0,2} \sigma_{t-1}^2 + \nu_{0,3} \tilde{W}_{t-1}^2, \quad \tilde{Z}_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

with $\nu_{0,1} = \nu_{0,2} = 0.1$ and $\nu_{0,3} = 0.5$. As mentioned already in Section 2, the logarithmic transformation fits into the location specification 2.5 considered in our theoretical analysis. This specification is inspired by the best performing model of our empirical application; see the discussion surrounding Table 5.2.

As in our empirical application, we set $n = 11$ and consider otherwise the same Monte Carlo setting as in Section 4. Again, the small sample evidence contained in Table C.1 reveals a good performance of the proposed simulation-based estimator and the two associated hypothesis tests.

Table C.1: Simulation results (design 1A & 1B)

n	T		1A (simulable)				1B (estimable)			
			$\zeta_{0,1}$	ξ_0	$\zeta_{0,2}$	α_0	$\zeta_{0,1}$	$\zeta_{0,2}$	α_0	β_0
			0.2	-0.2	0.33	1.5	0.2	0.33	1.25	0.8
11	500	mean	0.199	-0.196	0.341	1.492	0.192	0.326	1.325	0.750
		median	0.200	-0.196	0.349	1.462	0.181	0.330	1.286	0.788
		var	0.009	0.006	0.003	0.060	0.016	0.003	0.133	0.061
		rmse	0.094	0.078	0.051	0.246	0.128	0.057	0.372	0.253
		t	4.40	4.60	8.40	4.20	3.40	5.80	8.00	8.20
		J		3.80				3.60		
1,000		mean	0.199	-0.196	0.334	1.500	0.193	0.332	1.279	0.784
		median	0.200	-0.197	0.336	1.497	0.190	0.332	1.258	0.800
		var	0.005	0.003	0.001	0.020	0.011	0.001	0.047	0.026
		rmse	0.069	0.052	0.037	0.142	0.107	0.036	0.219	0.163
		t	3.60	4.40	7.80	3.00	3.20	5.00	5.00	4.40
		J		5.20				3.80		
1,500		mean	0.201	-0.198	0.335	1.500	0.194	0.332	1.270	0.792
		median	0.200	-0.199	0.335	1.493	0.190	0.333	1.256	0.799
		var	0.003	0.002	0.001	0.013	0.009	0.001	0.031	0.017
		rmse	0.058	0.044	0.030	0.114	0.093	0.028	0.176	0.131
		t	5.00	5.40	8.40	2.80	4.20	3.80	3.40	4.20
		J		6.80				4.40		
2,000		mean	0.202	-0.197	0.331	1.507	0.194	0.331	1.263	0.795
		median	0.200	-0.196	0.331	1.507	0.183	0.332	1.255	0.816
		var	0.003	0.001	0.001	0.011	0.008	0.001	0.027	0.014
		rmse	0.050	0.036	0.028	0.106	0.092	0.030	0.164	0.117
		t	4.00	3.50	9.50	5.00	3.50	5.50	6.00	3.50
		J		6.70				6.00		